DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 424 CS 510 309

AUTHOR	Hugenberg, Lawrence W., Ed.
TITLE	Basic Communication Course Annual. Volume 10.
ISBN	ISBN-0-89641-312-8
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	186p.; For volume 9, see CS 510 308.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Press, 28 State Street, Suite 100, Boston, MA 02199. Tel: 617-247-0022.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Cognitive Style; Communication Research; Communication Skills; English (Second Language); Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; *Introductory Courses; Literature Reviews; Multiple Intelligences; Self Esteem; *Speech Communication; Teaching Assistants; Teaching Methods; Theory Practice Relationship; Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

This volume of an annual collection presents 10 essays relating to instruction in the basic communication course. The essays are: "The Basic Course and the Future of the Workplace" (Andrew D. Wolvin); "Predictors of Self-Perceptions of Behavioral Competence, Self-Esteem, and Willingness to Communicate: A Study Assessing Impact in a Basic Interpersonal Communication Course" (Sherwyn P. Morreale, Michael Z. Hackman, and Michael R. Neer); "Learning Style Preferences and Academic Achievement Within the Basic Communication Course" (Charles A. Lubbers and William J. Seiler); "Graduate Teaching Assistant Training: Preparing Instructors to Assist ESL Students in the Introductory Public Speaking Course" (Brooke L. Quigley, Katherine G. Hendrix, and Karen Freisem); "Applying Multiple Intelligences Theory to the Basic Public Speaking Course" (Kristi A. Schaller and Marybeth G. Callison); "Delineating the Uses of Practical Theory: A Reply to Hickson" (Shawn Spano); "Theory and Pedagogy in the Basic Course: A Summary From Spano and Hickson" (Mark Hickson, III); "Teaching the Honors Public Speaking Course" (Karla Kay Jensen and David E. Williams); and "Commentary: The Research Foundation for Instruction in the Beginning Public Speaking Course" (Lawrence W. Hugenberg and Barbara S. Moyer). (RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Hugenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 440 424

Basic Communication Course Annual

10

1998

Lawrence W. Hugenberg
Editor

CS 510 309

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL 10

1998

EDITOR
Lawrence W. Hugenberg

published by
american press
Boston, Massachusetts

Copyright © 1998 by American Press.
ISBN 0-89641-312-8

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Printed in the United States of America.

Editorial Board

Lawrence W. Hugenberg, Editor
Youngstown State University

Joe Ayres
Washington State University

Melissa L. Beall
University of Northern Iowa

Jacquelyn J. Buckrop
Ball State University

Nancy L. Buerkel-Rothfuss
Central Michigan University

Susan Redding Emel
Baker University

Jeanine Fassl
Univ. of Wisconsin, Whitewater

Gustav W. Friedrich
University of Oklahoma

Lisa J. Goodnight
Purdue University, Calumet

Nancy Rost Goulden
Kansas State University

Pamela L. Gray
Central Michigan University

Laurie L. Haleta
South Dakota State University

W. Lance Haynes
University of Missouri, Rolla

Karla Kay Jensen
Texas Tech University

John J. Makay
Bowling Green State University

Barbara S. Moyer
Bowling Green State University

Craig A. Newburger
University of Cincinnati

Don Orban
University of Florida

Terry M. Perkins
Eastern Illinois University

Virginia P. Richmond
Kent State University

Warren G. Sandmann
Mankato State University

Kristi A. Schaller
Georgia State University

William J. Seiler
University of Nebraska

Deanna Sellnow
North Dakota State University

Robert E. Smith
Purdue University

Douglas M. Trank
University of Iowa

Enid S. Waldhart
University of Kentucky

Samuel P. Wallace
University of Dayton

Andrew D. Wolvin
University of Maryland

Julia T. Wood
University of North Carolina

Donald D. Yoder
University of Dayton

Editorial Policy

The Editor and the Basic Course Commission invite submissions to the considered for publication in the *Basic Communication Course Annual.* The Annual is published by American Press (Boston, MA) and is distributed nationally to scholars and educators interested in the basic communication course. Articles are accepted for review throughout the year for publication consideration. However, the deadline for volume 11 of the *Annual* is March 1, 1998.

Manuscripts exploring significant issues for the basic course, research in the basic course, instructional practices, graduate assistant training, classroom teaching tips, or the status, role, and future of the basic communication course are invited. It is incumbent on contributors to establish a position on how the work they seek to have published advances knowledge in the area of the basic communication course. Only the very best manuscripts received are published. Quality is determined solely by the qualified Editorial Board and the Editor. Manuscripts submitted should not be under consideration for other journals or have appeared in any published form.

All manuscripts must conform to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association or they will be returned to the author(s). Each submission must be accompanied by a 100- to 150-word abstract of the manuscript and a 50- to 75-word author identification paragraph on each author following the format of the *Annual.* Manuscripts, in general, should not exceed 30 pages or approximately 9,000 words (including references, notes, tables, and figures).

Manuscripts that do not explore issues or pedagogy surrounding the basic communication course or that are seriously

flawed will be returned by the Editor. Manuscripts that are improperly prepared or suffer from substantial stylistic deficiencies will also be returned. Submissions deemed acceptable for the Annual will be sent for blind review to at least three members of the Editorial Board. Be sure all references to the author and institutional affiliation are removed from the text of the manuscript and the list of references. A separate title page should include: (1) a title and identification of the author(s), (2) professional title(s), address(es), telephone number(s), and electronic-mail address(es) (if available), and (3) any data concerning the manuscript's history. The history should include any previous public presentation or publication of any part of the data or portions of the manuscript, and, if the manuscript is drawn from a thesis or dissertation, the advisor's name.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced throughout, including references and notes. Do not use right justification. Manuscripts should use tables only when they are the most efficient mode of presenting data. Avoid tables that duplicate material in the text or that present information most readers do not require.

Authors should submit four (4) copies of manuscripts and retain the original. Manuscripts, abstracts, and author identification paragraph(s) should be sent to:

Lawrence W. Hugenberg, Editor
Basic Communication Course Annual
Department of Communication & Theater
Youngstown State University
One University Plaza
Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3631

Questions about the *Annual* or a potential submission may be directed to the Editor by phone at 330\742-3633 or via e-mail (aw869@yfn.ysu.edu).

Contents

The Basic Course and the Future of the Workplace 1
Andrew D. Wolvin

The preparation of students to function as effective communicators in the workplace is an important goal of the basic communication course. To meet this goal, students must be equipped with speaking and listening competencies in order to do their work. The basic hybrid course with units in intrapersonal, interpersonal, group, and public communication offers a viable framework for workplace communication.

Predictors of Self-Perceptions of Behavioral Competence, Self-Esteem, and Willingness to Communicate: A Study Assessing Impact in a Basic Interpersonal Communication Course 7
Sherwyn P. Morreale, Michael Z. Hackman and Michael R. Neer

Considering the emergent role of evaluation in higher education, it is important that assessment procedures be developed for all communication courses. Courses such as public speaking already have well established assessment programs while other courses are in need of additional attention. This article describes an assessment program that examines the impact of an interpersonal course on undergraduates' self-perceived behavioral and affective competence. Using a pre- and post-test model, assessment was based on administration of the Communication Behaviors Inventory, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Willingness to Communicate Scale. These outcomes were measured as a function of gender, age, and ethnicity. Results indicated that the course impacted similarly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

on students regardless of these predictor variables, with significant improvement being demonstrated for all groups of students. The article provides a description of the interpersonal course and its assessment procedures. The results of analyses of data are presented with a discussion of future directions for assessment in this course.

Learning Style Preferences and Academic Achievement Within the Basic Communication Course 27
Charles A. Lubbers and William J. Seiler

Students enrolled in a basic communication course taught using the personalized system of instruction (PSI) were studied to determine the influence of learning style preferences on academic achievement. The twenty measures of the Canfield Learning Style Inventory (CLSI) were regressed with three measures of student academic achievement. Eight of the twenty were significant in at least one of the three equations. Two of the learning style measures (class organization and performance expectations) were significant with all three measures of achievement. Two applications of the findings for basic course instructors are presented.

Graduate Teaching Assistant Training: Preparing Instructors to Assist ESL Students in the Introductory Public Speaking Course 58
Brooke L. Quigley, Katherine G. Hendrix and Karen Freisem

Much research identifies the need to assist English as a Second Language (ESL) students in our classrooms. Some communication educators have addressed this need by enrolling students in special sections of introductory courses for ESL students only. With a focus specifically on graduate teaching assistant (GTA) training, this paper suggests ways to assist ESL

students, along with native speaking students, enrolled in regular sections of the introductory public speaking course. We first identify steps for assessing whether an ESL student is appropriately enrolled in a course. We then focus on ways instructors can assist ESL students with: 1) pronunciation, comprehensibility, and listening, 2) thinking rhetorically, and 3) delivery skills.

Applying Multiple Intelligences Theory to the Basic Public Speaking Course 90
Kristi A. Schaller and Marybeth G. Callison

This article examines the theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI) (Gardner, 1983; 1993) as it applies to the basic public speaking course. According to MI theory, intelligence is not a single dimension but is a composite of several aptitudes and talents. Gardner believes that individuals possess more than one intelligence, and MI theory defines seven. We argue that the basic public speaking course is an excellent forum for addressing students' multiple intelligences while teaching oral and written communication skills. This paper introduces MI theory and provides suggested course assignments and activities that correspond with the multiple intelligences.

The Debate on the Uses of Practical Theory Continues

The first two essays by Spano and Hickson (Basic Communication Course Annual 8, 1996) involved some crucial issues about where the basic communication course stands in relation to theory, research, and practice. In this second round, specific examples are discussed by Spano. Hickson attempts to contextualize them. Such specificity involves delineating the nature of communication theory from a pragmatic perspective, not ideological from either a phenomenological not a positivistic stance. The importance of context is stressed and outlined as an aspect of human nature — perhaps the element which separates us from other living beings.

Delineating the Uses of Practical Theory:
A Reply to Hickson 105
Shawn Spano

Theory and Pedagogy in the Basic Course: A Summary
From Spano and Hickson 125
Mark Hickson, III

Teaching the Honors Public Speaking Course 133
Karla Kay Jensen and David E. Williams

The honors student comes to the public speaking class with a unique set of needs and learning preferences which require alterations to the traditional course. This article explores a variety of honors course formats, honors students' characteristics and learning preferences, and some ideas for restructuring the typical public speaking course to best accommodate honors students. As such, this article can serve as an initial step toward creating a new honors course or restructuring an existing course. The suggested formats and content changes can create added challenge and participatory experience to improve honors education.

COMMENTARY: The Research Foundationfor Instruction in the Beginning Public Speaking Course 157
Lawrence W. Hugenberg and Barbara S. Moyer

The history of public speaking instruction is rooted in classical rhetorical theories. There is a lack of recent communication research findings cited in textbooks to support instruction in the beginning public speaking course. This research examined five leading public speaking texts in the hopes of finding contemporary communication research findings to support the advice given to students. This survey reveals little research being cited in beginning public speaking texts. The authors conclude with a discussion of reasons why research is not cited and offer communication scholars a challenge to conduct research to support pedagogical claims.

Author Identifications 171

The Basic Course and the Future of the Workplace

Andrew D. Wolvin

One of the goals of the basic communication course is to prepare students to function as effective communicators in their future careers. The importance of communication in the workplace is well documented. Studies (Curtis, Winsor & Stephens, 1989, *What Work Requires of Schools,* 1991; Maes, Weldy & Icenogle, 1997) consistently demonstrate that oral communication skills — listening and speaking — are at the top of the list of skills necessary to get and to succeed in careers. A look at the classified ads in a Sunday edition of major metropolitan newspapers reveals that "demonstrated oral communication skills" are desired of successful job applicants. Indeed, the National Education Goals Panel's Goals 2000 specifies that literate Americans prepared to compete in a global economy need the ability to "think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems . . ." (*The National Education Goals Report*, 1996, p. xvi).

But what is the world of work? It is clear that America has made the shift from an industrial society to an information society. Workers are not identified as "knowledge workers," people who are likely to produce and to deal in information than in tangible goods and services. Vogt (1995) described this work: "Knowledge workers inquire, observe, synthesize, and communicate perspectives which result in more effective actions" (p. 99). To be effective, Vogt argued, the knowledge worker must possess a "superior capacity to mentally and verbally process ideas and information . . ." (p.

99). Clearly, the knowledge industry requires oral communication skills of the highest order.

To prepare students to be an effective knowledge worker in today's organizations, it is necessary to re-tool the basic communication course to provide a broad foundation in the speaking and listening competencies that workers must have in order to do their work. The hybrid course with units in intrapersonal, interpersonal, group, and public communication offers the most realistic framework for meeting this goal (Wolvin & Wolvin, 1992).

People in organizations increasingly are "empowered" with self-management, an approach to management which requires that each individual has to assume responsibility for her or his own career, finding the necessary motivators and strategies to be productive and satisfied within the mission and goals of the organization (Manz & Sims, 1989). To be effective as self-management, an individual has to know oneself as a communicator:

- How to process information
- What is their communication style
- How to manage their communicator image
- Self assessment (see, for example, Fisher, 1996).

And they have to be good at self-talk, internal messages that they give themselves for positive reinforcement, motivation, and decision-making (Helmstetter, 1987). In my work as a management consultant, I find that managers and would-be managers discover the study of intrapersonal communication to be one of the most important areas that I lead them through.

One specific application of intrapersonal communication that shapes an entire organization is that of listening behavior. People in organizations have to be good listeners; the business of the organization depends upon it (Wolvin & Coakley, 1996). And to be a good listener, people have to understand how and why they function as a listener and what

they can do to control for accurate message reception, focused attention, accurate decoding, and appropriate response.

At the interpersonal communication level, people in organizations participate in dialogues with others on a daily basis. Some people find that they lack good conversation skills, especially when it comes to small talk. And small talk is a necessary step for building rapport — a step critical in marketing and sales (Turecamo, 1994). Communicators also have to ask questions in order to get and to clarify information. And sending and receiving feedback is critical to job performance. In an extensive survey of managers and workers, Kepner-Tregoe, a consulting firm, discovered that less than 50% of the managers give immediate feedback about their workers' performance ("10 Essential Components," 1996).

One important application in interpersonal communication skills is in the interviewing process. Communication skills in the employment interview have been identified as the most important factor (more so than grade point average, work experience, activities, etc.) in getting into the workplace in the first place (Goodall & Goodall, 1982). The competitive job market requires that applicants communicate a positive, confident image throughout the entire selection process. But good interviewing skills do not stop there. Throughout one's career, an individual will have to demonstrate effective interviewing skills in order to move up the corporate ladder or to move on to other organizations or other careers (Shrieves, 1995). A person is likely to change jobs frequently in one's career lifetime, and each change will depend to a great extent on polished, professional interviewing skills.

Another application of interpersonal competencies is in the small group process. It has been determined that people spend as much as the equivalent of two or three days a week in meetings. Unfortunately, in many organizations that time is not very productive. Now that organizations have put into place participative management, however, there is a

widespread use of workteams. "As organizations become more involved in the quality movement, they discover the benefits of having people at all levels work together in teams," observes one corporate consultant (Scholtes, 1988, pp. 1-17). To function, teams have to be able to communicate, using all the group facilitation and decision-making skills that they can marshall.

Significantly, today's knowledge organizations also depend on public communication strategies (Scheiber & Hager, 1994). Because people are producing and dealing with information, that information must be disseminated, and not just in written reports and computer files. Many organizations rely on oral briefings as a primary means of internal communication. Effective briefings require all of the public speaking skills and applications of computerized presentation graphics for visual reinforcement of the oral message. Indeed, presentation graphics should be integrated into the basic communication course so that students have training in how to create and use computerized slides effectively (Shaw, 1996).

Smart organizations will develop speakers bureaus as part of their external communication strategy. Employees at various levels of an organization will be selected, trained, and scheduled to present speeches to the organization's publics — local civic organizations, professional societies, academic audiences, and even political bodies.

Clearly, the workplace today requires skilled communicators who can function effectively at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, group, and public communication levels. In outcomes assessment of the basic course (Wolvin & Corley, 1984; Ford & Wolvin, 1993; Kramer & Hinton, 1996), students reported improvement in their perceived competencies to communication on the job. Hugenberg (1996) has called for more attention to assessment and to the integration of technologies in the basic communication course. To ensure that our basic hybrid course response to the needs of today's workplace, we must heed Hugenberg's call and follow Pearson

and Nelson's (1990) advice to attend to new communication patterns and relationships and to new technologies that our students will encounter in their world of work.

REFERENCES

Curtis, D. B., Winsor, J. L., & Stephens, R. D. (1989). National preferences in business and communication education. *Communication Education, 38*, 6-14.

Fisher, A. (1996, November). Hey, hotshot, take a good look at yourself. *Fortune,* 211-212.

Goodall, D., & Goodall, H. L. (1982). The employment interview. *Communication Quarterly, 30*, 116-122.

Helmstetter, S. (1987). *The self-talk solution*. New York: Pocket Books.

Hugenberg, L. W. (1996). *The challenges of the 21st century: Continued evolution of the hybrid course.* Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, CA.

Maes, J. D., Weldy, T. G., & Icenogle, M. L. (1996). A managerial perspective: Oral communication competency is the most important for business students in the workplace. *The Journal of Business Communication,.33,* 67-80.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1989). *Superleadership*. New York: Prentice Hall.

The National Education Goals Report. (1996). Washington, D. C.: National Education Goals Panel.

Pearson, J. C., & Nelson, P. (1990). The future of the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2*, 1-26.

Scheiber, H. J., & Hager, P. J. (1994). Oral communication in business and industry: Results of a survey on scientific,

technical, and managerial presentations. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 24,* 161-180.

Scholtes, P. R. (1988). *The team handbook.* Madison, WI: Joiner.

Shaw, R. (1996). When the presentation went up in smoke. *Sky,* 39-43.

Shrieves, L. (1995, August 27). Older job seekers need a resume that makes waves. *The Washington Post,* H5.

10 Essential Components to Improving Performance. (1996). *Quality in Higher Education, 5,* 7.

Turecamo, D. (1994). Small talk is a big thing. *HR Magazine, 39,* 84-86.

Vogt, E. E. (1995). The nature of work in 2010: Convergence and the workplace. *Annual Review of the Institute for Information Studies,* 89-108.

What Work Requires of Schools. (1991). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills.

Wolvin, A. D. & Coakley, C. G. (1996). *Listening.* Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wolvin, A. D. & Corley, D. (1984). The technical speech communication course: A view from the field. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 24,* 83-91.

Wolvin, D. R. & Wolvin, A. D. (1992). Speech fundamentals: The basic course. In L. C. Lederman (ed.). *Communication pedagogy: Approaches to teaching undergraduate courses in communication* (pp. 281-302). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Predictors of Self-Perceptions of Behavioral Competence, Self-Esteem, and Willingness to Communicate: A Study Assessing Impact in a Basic Interpersonal Communication Course

Sherwyn P. Morreale
Michael Z. Hackman
Michael R. Neer

Recent national conferences and other scholarly writings have called attention to the importance of oral communication competency and its assessment (Backlund, 1990; McCroskey, 1982; Morreale, Berko, Brooks & Cooke, 1994; Pearson & Daniels, 1988; Rubin, 1990; Spitzberg, 1993). Communication scholars have focused on developing criteria, methods, models and instruments for assessment (Hay, 1992; Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1982; Morreale & Backlund, 1996; Rubin, 1982; Speech Communication Association, 1993; Spitzberg, 1983; Spitzberg, 1995; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). At the state and regional level, understanding and assessing oral competency has become increasingly important, with a focus on accreditation for colleges and universities (Allison, 1994; Chesebro, 1991; Litterst, Van Rheenen & Casmir, 1994).

Considering these trends, a need exists to develop and test methods for assessing competency in specific courses taught within the communication discipline. Earlier studies have explored assessment in the public speaking course. Ellis (1995) examined students' self perceptions of apprehension and competency and their perceptions of teacher immediacy

behaviors. Morreale, Hackman & Neer (1995) analyzed predictors of behavioral competence and self-esteem in a public speaking course. Rubin, Rubin and Jordan (1997) examined the effects of classroom instruction on students' levels of communication apprehension and their self-perceived communication competence in a basic course that included public speaking theory and practice. In addition to public speaking, another basic course of importance to the discipline is interpersonal communication (Gibson, Hanna, & Leichty, 1990). The present study describes an assessment program/process for the interpersonal communication course. This program utilizes a pre- and post-testing process to evaluate value-added dimensions of the course. This study is intended to:

1. examine the use of a course design that incorporates an assessment program in the interpersonal communication course;
2. explore the use of a pre- and post-test process and existing instruments for addressing program and course assessment; and,
3. provide an example of how the results of the assessment process can be interpreted and used by a communication department or program.

This article first describes the design and theoretical base of the interpersonal communication course where data were gathered for the present study. Then the course's assessment procedures for laboratory-based, pre- and post-assessment interviews are described. Results are presented summarizing the impact of the course on undergraduates' perceptions of behavioral competence, self-esteem, and willingness to communicate, as a function of their gender age and ethnicity.

COURSE DESIGN AND THEORETICAL BASE

Oral competency and communication training and development have been frequently related to the students' academic and professional success (Curtis, Winsor & Stephens, 1989; Ford & Wolvin, 1993; Rubin & Graham, 1988; Rubin, Graham & Mignerey, 1990; Vangelisti & Daly, 1989). To support students' development of oral competency, the interpersonal course described in this study is based on a theoretical model for communication competence articulated within the discipline and described below (Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1982; Shockley-Zalabak, 1992; Spitzberg, 1983). In addition, individualized instruction and personalized relationships with students are made possible utilizing the support of graduate teaching assistants in an individualized assistance laboratory setting (Seiler & Fuss-Reineck, 1986).

Course Description

Structurally, the course utilizes a lecture/laboratory instructional model. Students interact with the laboratory staff and use multimedia materials to supplement the traditional classroom approach to instruction. In addition to attending weekly lectures, all students have access to and are required to utilize the communication laboratory to satisfy a series of course requirements. The course design includes an entrance and an exit interview for each student. The entrance interview, scheduled during the first three weeks of the term, is conducted by a graduate teaching assistant and consists of setting personal goals for the course and assessing students' self-perceived communication behaviors, self-esteem, and willingness to communicate. The exit interview, scheduled during the final three weeks of the term, consists of reviewing personal course goals, administering the same instruments as in

the entrance interview, and discussing the course's final paper. Both the entrance and the exit interview are course requirements for all students. Additionally each student is required to participate, at some time during the semester, in a minimum of two other lab-based training modules, workshops, or individual assistance programs.*

Theoretical Base

A review of the literature on communication competency suggests a composite model of competence should include and focus on four dimensions or domains: cognition, behaviors, affect, and ethics. In the course described herein, specific objectives and criteria for assessment in each domain are articulated for students as follows:

Cognitive Domain. The student will be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the theories and concepts related to interpersonal communication.

The cognitive domain involves learning about the communication process and the elements involved in a communication event. Attendance at and participation in all lectures is expected for students to gain competence in this domain. Students demonstrate their knowledge and understanding through three in-class objective exams and a written final exam administered at the end of the course.

Behavioral Domain. The student will be able to demonstrate improvement in interpersonal behaviors and communication skills related to the interpersonal process. The behavioral domain includes both abilities possessed by the communicator and observable skills or behaviors. Students demonstrate improved interpersonal communication skills

---

* A copy of the syllabus used in the course described in this study can be obtained by writing: Dr. Michael Hackman, Department of Communication, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, Colorado Springs, CO 80933-7150.

through participation in in-class experiential learning activities and involvement in two workshops scheduled during regular class time. Also, students are pre- and post-tested during entrance and exit interviews regarding their self-perceptions of behavioral competence. In the exit interview, they demonstrate interpersonal behavioral competence in an oral dyadic discussion of their final paper.

Affective Domain. The student will demonstrate improvement in how he or she feels about his or her self as an interpersonal communicator.

The affective domain encompasses the communicator's feelings, attitudes, motivation, and willingness to communicate. Students are pre- and post-tested during entrance and exit interviews regarding their self-esteem and willingness to communicate, both self-report indicators of how the student feels about self as an interpersonal communicator.

Ethical Domain. The student will demonstrate a set of personal ethics in regard to interpersonal communication.

The ethical domain consists of the communicator's ability and willingness to take moral responsibility for the outcome of the communication event. Students demonstrate the development of a set of interpersonal communication ethics by writing their own interpersonal ethics statement. The ethics statement is developed by the student based on his or her own experiences in life and reactions to course lecture material and other selected readings on ethics available in the laboratory.

METHOD

Research Design

The present study utilized a pre- and post-testing process to evaluate value-added dimensions of the interpersonal communication course. Despite threats to internal validity raised by the use of such a process and design, regional

accreditation agencies recently have begun to laud this method, calling it a neglected concept and practice in many departmental assessment programs (Lopez, 1995). The results of pre- and post-testing are now considered useful benchmarks for measuring learning from entry to exit and for evaluating value-added aspects of a course or program.

Participants

Subjects were 306 undergraduate students enrolled in a lower division interpersonal communication course at a mid-sized urban commuter university in the western United States from 1993-1996.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: What impact will gender, age, and ethnicity have on changes in students' self-perceptions of their behavioral competence?

RQ2: What impact will gender, age, and ethnicity have on changes in students' level of self-esteem?

RQ3: What impact will gender, age, and ethnicity have on changes in students' level of willingness to communicate?

The predictor variables (gender, age, ethnicity) were selected in order to determine whether the laboratory-supported course described in this article impacts all students similarly regardless of their biological sex, chronological age, or their ethnicity. An important consideration in the selection of age, gender and ethnicity is an argument put forth by Fitzpatrick (1993) and Kramarae (1992) that communication scholars have demonstrated a shocking disregard for the

potential impact of these variables. They suggest that these variables, as well as several contextual factors, are often central to the building of shared social realities based on similar life experiences.

The three research questions related to changes in students' self-perceptions of their behavioral competence, self-esteem, and willingness to communicate were evaluated using multiple regression. Thus, the data reported in this study relate to only the affective domain of learning in this interpersonal-based laboratory course. Predictor variables were gender (female=207, male=99), age (mean=25.85, sd=10.22), and ethnicity (Anglo=249, non-Anglo=57). Measurement, or outcome, variables were self-perceptions of communication behaviors, self-esteem, and willingness to communicate. These outcome variables were selected because they were believed to be among the most likely variables to be impacted by the interpersonal course.

Data Collection and Interview Process

As indicated earlier, assessment instruments were administered in the communication laboratory during entrance and exit interviews conducted by graduate teaching assistants. The interviews were held during the first and final three weeks of the term. The same instruments were administered in both interviews. The one-hour interviews were conducted by TAs trained to administer the selected tools to students. TAs attended pre-semester training and weekly meetings during the term focusing on administering and interpreting the tools. The same TA conducted the pre- and post-interviews with each student. During the entrance interview, pretest scores were used to indicate strengths and weaknesses that the student should consider during the course. Also, students set personal goals for the course. During the exit interview, students reviewed and discussed

changes between their pre- and post-test scores. Students also submitted a final paper at the exit interview and discussed the paper and the personal goals set earlier. The final paper was a synthesis of everything the student had learned in the course, reflecting on personal goals set and accomplished. To assure confidentiality and encourage honesty in completing the assessment tools, students were informed that the classroom instructors did not have access to student scores, nor did the scores affect their grade in any way.

Measurement Instruments

The following instruments were administered to students in both the pre- and post-interviews: the Communication Behaviors Inventory (CBI; Morley, Morreale, & Naylor, 1993); the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965); and the Willingness to Communicate (WTC; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). These scales were selected based on widespread acceptance in the literature and their consistent reliability and validity.

Behavioral Competence. Self-report of communication behaviors was measured with the Communication Behaviors Inventory (CBI; Morley, Morreale & Naylor, 1993) which identifies communication behaviors and behavioral predispositions that would predict positive student outcomes. The instrument was developed and tested for use in the communication lab, based on the behavior-analytic model of Goldfried and D'Zurilla (1969). This 93-item, 7-step, Likert-type scale assesses a student's self-perceptions or predispositions to behave in regard to five factors, identified as important communication situations or interactions for students at a four-year college or university (communication with faculty and staff, sensitivity to others, communication with different people, public speaking apprehension, and fight or flight). In

the current study, alpha reliabilities were .77 for the pre-test and .75 for the post-test.

Self Esteem. Self-report of esteem was measured with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965). This 10-item, 4-step Likert-type scale has been used extensively in psychological research. In this study, the RSE scale revealed an alpha co-efficient of .78 with the pre-administration and an alpha coefficient of .76 with the post-administration.

Willingness to Communicate. Students' willingness to communicate was assessed using the Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). This instrument is designed to measure an individual's predisposition toward approaching or avoiding the initiation of communication. The WTC is a 20-item probability estimate scale made up of 12 items which comprise the measure and 8 items which are fillers. The 12 items on the scale assess an individual's willingness to communicate in four contexts (public speaking, meeting, group, and dyad) and with three types of receivers (stranger, acquaintance, and friend). In the current study, alpha reliabilities were .92 for the pre-test and .93 for the post-test.

DATA ANALYSES

Analyses consisted of multiple regression between the predictors and the dependent measures. The predictors were dummy-coded and entered in the regression model as dichotomous variables, with the exception of respondent age which was entered as a continuous variable. A second set of regression analyses was conducted with pre-scores on the dependent measures also entered as predictors of post-scores. Additional analysis consisted of paired t-tests with each subsample of the three predictors to determine mean differences and strength of relationship between pre- and post- scores on

the dependent measure. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) also was conducted between the predictor variables and the measurement variables to determine whether the predictor variables would predict post-scores when controlling for pre-scores. Participant age was recast as a dichotomous variable at the median split (age 22 and younger vs. age 23 and older).

RESULTS

Non-mediated results revealed that students enrolled in the laboratory-intensive approach to basic interpersonal communication experienced significant gains in perceived self-esteem (Pre-mean = 33.12, SD = 4.90, Post-mean = 34.72, SD = 4.10, r = .61, t-value = 8.78, p <.01), perceived willingness to communicate (Pre-mean = 73.37, SD = 24.25, Post-mean = 80.09, SD = 14.74, r = .29, t-value = 4.49, p <.02), and perceived behavioral communication competence (Pre-mean = 3.18, SD = .83, Post-mean = 3.57, SD = .95, r = .58, t-value = 8.20, p < .01).

Test of Research Questions

RQ1 examined the impact of age, gender, and ethnicity on self-perceptions of behavioral communication competence. Regression revealed that all three variables failed to predict behavioral competence (R = .09, F = .83 (3,279), p < .42). Table 1 reports zero-order correlations between the predictors and dependent measures.

RQ2 examined the influence of age, ethnicity, and respondent age on perceived self-esteem. Regression demonstrated that none of the predictors impacted on self- esteem (R = .09, F = .78 (3,279), p< .50). Table 1 reports zero-order correlations between the predictors and self-esteem.

RQ3 investigated whether age, gender, and ethnicity would impact upon perceived willingness to communicate. Findings revealed that none of the predictors impacted on willingness to communicate ($R = .05$, $F = .23$ (3,289), $p < .57$). Table 1 reports zero-order correlations between the predictors and willingness to communicate.

Table 1
Correlations For Gain Scores

	Gain in Esteem	Gain in Willingness	Gain in Competence
Post-Esteem	.33	.03	.20
Post-Willingness	.02	.26	.19
Post-Competence	.10	.02	.50
Pre-Esteem	.41	.04	.08
Pre-Willingness	.08	.54	.06
Pre-Competence	.08	.16	.39
Age	.01	.05	.04
Gender	.04	.03	.02
Ethnicity	.05	.03	.10

Note: correlations above .16 ($p<.05$ and above .39 ($p<.01$)

Relationship Among Test Variables

Regression was conducted a second time with post scores for the three dependent measures; in this model, however, in addition to the three predictors, pre-scores on the three dependent measures were entered as predictors. As zero-order correlations in Table 2 indicate, post-scores were best predicted by pre-scores of each measure. Additionally, gain scores were significantly, although only moderately, inter-correlated.

For instance, the self-esteem gain score was significantly correlated with the behavioral communication competence gain score. The willingness to communicate gain score was significantly correlated with the behavioral competence gain score. Only the self-esteem gain score and the willingness to communicate gain score were not significantly correlated. Examination of zero-order correlations in Table 2 further demonstrated that post scores on each dependent measure were best predicted by their own pre-scores.

ANCOVA revealed that the predictor variables were unable to predict post-scores when controlling for the effects of pre-scores. For instance, significance was observed with ethnicity on behavioral competence post-scores (Anglo Post-mean = 17.03, Non-anglo Post-mean = 18.46, F (1,344) = 9.30, p <.02, d = .04). However, when pre-scores for behavioral competence were entered as covariates (Anglo Pre-mean = 15.26, Non-anglo Pre-mean = 17.13), ANCOVA revealed that the behavioral competence pre-score (MR = .62, F (1,328) = 186.90, p < .001, eta-squared = .38) removed ethnicity from

Table 2
Correlation For Pre- and Post-Scores

	E1	E2	W1	W2	C1	C2
Age (A)	.03	.02	.01	.01	.13	.13
Gender (G)	-.15	-.17	.09	.06	.13	.11
Ethnicity (E)	.07	.07	.02	.05	-.13	.08
Pre-Esteem (E1)		.72	.24	.24	.40	.30
Post-Esteem (E2)			.23	.26	.36	.40
Pre-Willing (W1)				.63	.35	.27
Post-Willing (W2)					.26	.35
Pre-Comp (C1)						.59
Post-Comp (C2)						

Note: correlations above .16 (p<.05) and above .39 (p<.01)

the equation ($F = 2.92$, $p < 09$, power =.55). Similar findings were observed with the remaining ANCOVA models and will not be tabled because they confirm findings for regression.

DISCUSSION

Findings in this study confirm that a laboratory-centered basic interpersonal course which emphasizes interaction between student and laboratory staff significantly impacts on perceived gains in self-esteem, willingness to communicate, and behavioral communication competence. However, as simple correlations indicate, gain or change scores were best predicted by both pre- and post-scores. Furthermore, non-mediated results show that the predictor variables do not predict gain scores. These findings may be interpreted to mean that what one brings to the course predicts how one leaves the course.

This interpretation, however, does not account for the significant gains that participants reported on all three dependent measures. The fact that the predictors failed to mediate findings should, indeed, be interpreted as a positive finding because it demonstrates that the course impacts favorably on all students. Thus, findings in this study are encouraging if viewed in this light. The literature referenced earlier indicates that academic, personal, and professional success are linked to communication competence. A course that favorably impacts all students on several communication variables is a valuable course. Indeed, a university's decision to increase funding for a course may, in part, be tied to a department's ability to structure a course that does not discriminate by gender, ethnicity, and age.

University administrators may prefer the more narrow reporting of non-mediated findings, especially when reviewing data from many different courses. Communication educators, on the other hand, are more broadly concerned with identify-

ing variables that impact on the learning process of students. While the variables tested in this study did not impact on the learning experience, additional variables should be assessed for their impact. Two of the most obvious candidates for study include trait anxiety and state anxiety. Each of these variables has been demonstrated to impact on oral performance and other aspects of the learning experience and it should be determined if either variable mediates the impact of the laboratory-centered approach to interpersonal instruction. Examination of situational factors contributing to both trait- and state-anxiety also may prove useful candidates for examination, particularly since the laboratory-centered approach is designed to minimize discomfort and evaluation apprehension while increasing task familiarity and acquaintance level among students.

Until these variables are examined, we may now only conclude that students who complete the interpersonal laboratory course generally experience significant gains in the three areas of affective learning tested in this study. The inclusion of additional predictors in future studies may very well temper this conclusion. In fact, when pre-scores were defined as covariates of post-scores, we may further conclude that affective learning is better predicted by students' initial perceptions of their self-esteem, willingness to communicate, and behavioral competence when entering the course than by their age, gender, and ethnicity. Because we believe that the laboratory approach designed for this course provides the best instruction possible for all students, a control group was not tested for comparison so that all students may benefit from the same instruction. Nevertheless, future studies should attempt to determine which aspects of the laboratory design yield the greatest impact. Potential aspects for testing might include the quality of the interpersonal and professional relationship between lab staff and student, size of class, and self-insights that students generate in their interpersonal ethics paper. Examining specific instructional components of

the course may be particularly useful in helping to determine whether the positive affect they may produce offsets any negative affect produced by both trait anxiety and state anxiety. We might predict, for instance, that an effective interpersonal relationship between lab staff and student may moderate evaluation apprehension. This may appear to represent conventional wisdom; future research, however, should confirm (or reject) whether this is the case.

In addition to identifying a wider range of predictor variables, future studies also should examine a wider range of dependent measures. For instance, we would expect that students who report increased esteem and willingness to communicate to also report an increase in perceptions of the effectiveness of their communication behaviors. Several communication measures exist to test whether quality of communication increases as self-esteem and willingness to communicate increase. For instance, interaction involvement (Cegala, Savage, Bruner & Conrad, 1982) and rhetorical sensitivity (Hart & Burks, 1972) are but two of many such instruments that have accumulated supportive data bases. Norton's (1978) Communicator Style Inventory also would be an appropriate measure to consider because of its emphasis on how people perceive they enact communication behaviors.

Finally, the pre- post-test design used in this study could be augmented to assess all four domains of competence included in the theoretical model that is the foundation of the course. Presently, the Communication Behaviors Inventory assesses students' perceptions in the behavioral domain of competence, but not the performance of those behaviors. The assessment of self-esteem and willingness to communicate are both subsumed in the affective domain. The assessment program for the course could be augmented to include pre- and post-testing of students' achievement in both the cognitive and ethical domains of competence.

Despite the shortcomings of the present study, a first step has been taken in describing the impact of a laboratory-

centered interpersonal course on increasing perceived self-esteem, willingness to communicate, and behavioral communication competence. This study has ruled out three sociographic variables as predictors (age, ethnicity and gender), thus showing that the interpersonal laboratory does not discriminate among students on these variables. Additional variables must be identified as candidates for future testing in order to establish whether they provide a filter through which students' learning experience is processed. Identifying both predictor and dependent variables may eventually yield more discriminating mean differences and regression coefficients than those observed in this study. Because the interpersonal laboratory tested in this study has impacted positively on students, perhaps the best test of its impact may lie in examining specific instructional components of the lab. Recent national surveys (Curtis, Winsor & Stephens, 1989) have confirmed the importance of interpersonal competence in the workplace. A laboratory-centered approach to interpersonal instruction, when compared to a non-laboratory instructional approach, may perform a central role in developing students' interpersonal competencies.

REFERENCES

Allison, T. (1994). The effect of regional standards on assessing oral communication. In R. Berko, S. Morreale, M. Brooks & C. Cooke (Eds.). *Proceedings of SCA' s Summer Conference on Assessing Collegiate Communication Competency* (pp. 179-186). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Backlund, P. (1990). *SCA national conference on the assessment of oral communication competency.* Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Cegala, D. J., Savage, G. T., Bruner, C. C. & Conrad, A. B. (1982). An elaboration of interaction involvement: Toward the development of a theoretical construct. *Communication Monographs, 49,* 229-248.

Chesebro, J. (1991). Oral communication competency and assessment as a component of college and university accreditation. *The Carolinas Speech Communication Annual, 7,* 7-22.

Curtis, D., Winsor, J. & Stephens, R. (1989). National preferences in business and communication education. *Communication, 38,* 6-14.

Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, self-perceived competency, and teacher immediacy in the laboratory-supported public speaking course: Trends and relationships. *Communication Education, 44,* 64-78.

Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1993). Communication and the new world of relationships. *Journal of Communication, 43,* 119-126.

Ford, W. S. Z. & Wolvin, A. D. (1993). The differential impact of a basic communication course on perceived communication competencies in class, work, and social contexts. *Communication Education, 42,* 215-223.

Gibson, J., Hanna, M. & Leichty, G. (1990). The basic course at U.S. colleges and universities: V. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2,* 233-257.

Goldfried, M. R., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1969). Behavioral analytic model, in C. D. Speilberger (Ed.), *Current topics in clinical and community psychology.* (pp. 151-196). New York: Academic Press.

Hart, R. P. & Burks, D. M. (1972). Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. *Communication Monographs, 39,* 75-91.

Hay, E. (1992). *Program assessment in communication.* Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Kramarae, C. (1992). Gender and dominance. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 15* (pp. 469-472). Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Littlejohn, S. W. & Jabusch, D. M. (1982). Communication competence: Model and application. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 10,* 29-37.

Litterst, J., Van Rheenen, D. & Casmir, M. (1994). The effects of state standards on oral competency assessment. In R. Berko, S. Morreale, M. Brooks & C. Cooke (Eds.). *Proceedings of SCA's' Summer Conference on Assessing Collegiate Communication Competency* (pp. 187-216). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Lopez, C. L. *Opportunities for Improvement: Advice from consultant-evaluators on programs to assess student learning.* Chicago, IL: The North Central Accreditation Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. *Communication Education, 13,* 2-7.

McCroskey, J. C. & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morley, D., Morreale, S., Naylor, J. & K. King (1994). "The CBI II": Additional developments in a lower bound estimator of communication competency. In R. Berko, S. Morreale, M. Brooks & C. Cooke (Eds.), *Proceedings of SCA's Summer Conference on Assessing Collegiate Communication Competency* (pp. 407-434). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Morreale, S. P. & Backlund, P. M. (1996). *Large scale assessment of oral communication* (2nd ed). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Morreale, S., Berko, R., Brooks, M. & Cooke, C. (Eds.) (1994). *Proceedings of SCA's summer conference on assessing collegiate communication competency.* Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Morreale, S. P., Hackman, M. Z. & Neer, M. R. (1995). Predictors of behavioral competence and self-esteem: A study assessing impact in a basic public speaking course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 7,* 125-141.

Norton, R. W. (1978). Foundations of a communicator style construct. *Human Communication Research, 4,* 99-112.

Pearson, J. C. & Daniels, T. D. (1988). Oh, what tangled webs we weave: Concerns about current conceptions of communication competence. *Communication Reports, 1,* 95-100.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rubin, R. B. (1982). *Communication competency assessment instrument.* Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Rubin, R. B. (1990). Communication competence. In G. M. Phillips & J. T. Wood (Eds.), *Speech communication: Essays to Commemorate the 75th Anniversary of the Speech Communication Association* (pp. 94-129). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rubin, R., & Graham, E. (1988). Correlates of college success. *Communication Education, 37,* 14-27.

Rubin, R., Graham, E. & Mignerey, J. (1990). A longitudinal study of college students' communication competence. *Communication Education, 39,* 1-13.

Rubin R. B., Rubin, A. M. & Jordan, F. F. (1997). Effects of instruction on communication apprehension and communication competence. *Communication Education, 46,* 104-114.

Seiler, W. & Fuss-Reineck, M. (1986). Developing the personalized system of instruction for the basic speech communication course. *Communication Education, 35,* 126-133.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1992). *Fundamentals of organizational communication* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Speech Communication Association. (1993). *SCA policy on criteria for assessment instruments.* Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. *Communication, 32,* 323-329.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1993). The dialectics of (in)competence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10,* 137-158.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). *The conversational skills rating scale.* Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Spitzberg, B. H. & Cupach, W. R. (1989). *Handbook of interpersonal competence research.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Vangelisti, A. & Daly, J. (1989). Correlates of speaking skills in the United States: A national assessment. *Communication Education, 38,* 132-143.

Learning Style Preferences and Academic Achievement within the Basic Communication Course

Charles A. Lubbers
William J. Seiler

> *"It seems quite logical that students learn differently in different situations, and it is obvious that different students learn differently"* (Schliessmann, 1987, p. 2).

Schliessmann's (1987) quote outlines the overall logic behind the importance of individual student characteristics in the study of instruction. While the concept is simple, studying it has proven to be a great deal more difficult.

It is clear that individual students will learn differently in different settings. However, it is not clear how specific students characteristics interact with the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) method of instruction. This method allows students to complete the course at their own pace under the guidance of undergraduate "teachers". Some students appear to thrive in the PSI method of instruction while others have great difficulty with it. Since most PSI courses are highly structured, the answer to the differences between those students who thrive and those who have difficulty may be their preferred styles of learning.

The research problem addressed in this study is: Do student learning style preferences affect academic achievement in a PSI-taught, basic communication course? The literature indicates that students' learning styles may be the single most important factor in their academic achievement (Enochs,

Handley, & Wollenberg, 1986). Learning styles influence academic achievement for the student and represent a challenge for the educator.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The theoretical foundation underlying learning style is located within the statement that every individual is unique. Thus, "there never was and never will be 'one best way' of doing anything in education because people are different!" (Frymier, 1977, p. 47). Each of us has ". . . an identifiable and preferred learning style" (James & Galbraith, 1985, p. 20) that is as individual as our signature (Dunn, Beaudry & Klavas, 1989, p. 50). These passages note the "individual" nature of education. Since the PSI method is designed to individualize instruction, it would seem that learning style would be an important variable to study.

Definition of Learning Style

Bonham (1988a, 1988b), argued that one of the problems with the use of learning style is that there has been no consensus definition. In the past, some researchers have used the terms "learning style" and "cognitive style" interchangeably (Bonham, 1988b; Korhonen & McCall, 1986). This investigation is concerned with learning style and not cognitive style, so it is important to delineate the differences between these two concepts. Bonham (1988b) reviewed the learning style literature and provides the key differences between learning and cognitive styles. The younger concept of learning style generally has a practical research focus on the classroom. The self-report measures normally associated with learning style attempt to measure an individual's preferences in terms of a variety of elements in the education process. "Most learning

styles are bipolar; generally, no greater value is placed on either extreme. One may, for example, be a kinesthetic or an audiovisual learner and require structured or non-structured learning environments" (Pettigrew & Buell, 1989, p. 187). However, the learning style instrument chosen for this investigation avoids the bipolar trap. Scores on the various elements included on the instrument are not based on two choices, and the values for each element can range from six to thirty.

Arguments for Studying Learning Style

Three areas of argument support learning style as an important student characteristic: (1) its effect on academic achievement; (2) its effect on student's perceptual preferences; and (3) the problems it creates for educators.

The importance of learning styles in education is most notable when the role learning style plays in academic achievement is explained. Enochs, Handley and Wollenberg (1986) provide initial insight into the role of learning style and academic achievement in the following passage:

> Many authorities believe that how students learn is perhaps the single most important factor in their academic achievement . . . . Proponents of the learning style movement (Barbe & Swassing, 1979) further propose that variability in student performance results not so much from discrepancies in intelligence but that such deviations are due to different styles of learning. In support of this view, according to Clements (1976), investigations have demonstrated increased academic achievement among students taught as a function of their individual learning styles (p. 136).

McDermott (1984) studied 100 Kindergartners in traditional classroom settings and found that learning styles predicted statistically significant portions of a student's later academic achievement. If learning style has such strong

predictive power at this early age, it seems reasonable to assume that its influence on academic achievement continues throughout life. Soroko (1988) found that the relationship did continue through to post-secondary education. He reported that earlier research concerning accounting students by Gregorc and Ward (1977) found that the learning process is hindered when the teaching style does not meet the needs of a particular learning style. Learning style preferences have been correlated with grades in college courses concerning computer applications in education (Davidson, 1992) and composition (Emanuel & Potter, 1992).

Researchers have argued that learning styles are especially important for specific portions of the college population, namely, nontraditional students (Schroeder, 1993), reentering students (Riechmann-Hruska, 1989), external degree students (Willett & Adams, 1985), academically underprepared students (Williams, et al., 1989) and adult learners (Holtzclaw, 1985).

Miller, Alway and McKinley (1987) reviewed the literature relating learning style and academic achievement and found strong correlational support for the connection between learning style and GPA. They reported, ". . . that some learning styles have had consistently positive and moderate relationships with GPA (r's ranging from .20 to .40), whereas other learning styles have had a negative relationship (r's ranging from -.20 to -.40) with GPA" (400).

A second argument for studying student learning styles is found in the student's perceptual preferences. James and Galbraith (1985) note that learning styles can be viewed as the student's preferred mode of using the information that surrounds him or her. They argued that, "The perceptual modality is comprised of seven elements which are as follows: Print, Aural, Interactive, Visual, Haptic, Kinesthetic, and Olfactory" (p. 20). Each perceptual preference influences what information is taken in, how it is taken in, etc., resulting in an affect on learning.

In a comprehensive review of research relating to learning styles, Dunn, Beaudry and Klavas (1989) reviewed eight studies published from 1977 to 1986 related to perceptual preferences. They concluded:

> . . . when youngsters were taught with instructional resources that both matched and mismatched their preferred modalities, they achieved statistically higher test scores in modality-matched, rather than mismatched, treatments . . . . In addition, when children were taught with multisensory resources, but initially through their most preferred modality and then were reinforced through their secondary or tertiary modality, their scores increased even more.

However, the effects on perceptions are not limited to perceptions of course content. Armstrong (1981) found a .87 correlation between whether instructors taught according to student perceptions of good teaching and student ratings of teaching effectiveness. Thus, learning styles influence a student's perceptual preferences and ultimately affect their academic achievement.

The final argument for investigating learning styles is the problem they create for educators. Snow (1986) notes that the vast differences in individual students' learning styles causes real problems for educators (for example, modifying instructional materials, varying instructional techniques, etc). Educators realize the need for recognition of learning styles, however adapting to these needs has been difficult. Some educators have argued that the goal of education should be to determine the students' learning styles and match instructional materials to the style (Corbett & Smith, 1984), while others see the need to teach the student to ". . . manage and monitor their selection and use of various learning styles . . ." (Miller, Alway & McKinley, 1987, p. 399). The undeniable conclusion one reaches is that the role a student's learning style plays on her or his academic achievement requires edu-

cators to discover methods for meeting the individual differences.

Learning Style and PSI

How students' learning styles affect academic achievement in, and satisfaction with, a PSI taught course has not been extensively examined in the existing literature. The PSI course under investigation does not use computer assisted instruction so common to research related to individualized or mastery approaches. Rather, this course relies on undergraduate proctors and extensive use of written materials.

The premise that education should be individualized seems obvious for a system called the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI). The notion that learning style influences how much students learn (Meighan, 1985) is even more significant when one notes that Schliessmann (1987) found little research focusing on learning style in specific learning situations such as the basic communication course. The lack of research related to learning styles in the basic communication course is surprising since studies of the influence of learning styles in other disciplines are very common. A brief review of research finds examples of investigations of learning styles in agriculture (Torres & Cano, 1994), business (Campbell, 1991), physical education (Pettigrew & Buell 1989), science (Melear & Pitchford, 1991), math (Clariana & Smith, 1988), English (Carrell & Monroe, 1993), psychology (Enns, 1993), and education (Skipper, 1992).

While previous research has outlined the importance learning styles in a large number of academic disciplines, these investigations have focused on classrooms using more traditional methods of instruction. There is a lack of research which indicates which learning styles are most appropriate for individualized instruction within the PSI taught course. Andrews (1981) provided one of the few examples of research

which indicates those learning styles which are appropriate for individualized instruction. Andrews found that in an introductory chemistry course the peer-centered method of instruction was most beneficial for collaboratively oriented students, while competitive students reported greater learning with instructor-centered instruction. Andrews argued that these results support, ". . . the study's core hypothesis: that students learn best in settings that meet their social-emotional needs and are attuned to their predominant patters of behavior" (p. 176).

A second study in this area was conducted by Jacobs (1982). Gorham (1986) says in her review of learning style literature that, "Jacobs (ED 223 223) found a significantly greater tendency for FD [Field Dependent] students to initiate social contact with proctors as a means of obtaining course information in a PSI lab" (p. 413). This result implies that field-dependent students have a different interaction pattern than the field-independent students in the PSI taught course.

The above research is important because it offers some initial evidence that particular learning styles are more appropriate for PSI taught courses. However, there is a major weakness in the previous research in that both studies (Andrews, 1981; Jacobs, 1982) used the Kolb LSI as their measure of learning style. The Kolb instrument measures cognitive style (see, for example, O'Brien, 1994) rather than learning style, and it only provides scores on four scales.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects in this investigation were students enrolled in the PSI-format basic speech communication course at a large state university in the Midwest. All the students in the

course (approximately 540) were asked to participate in the project.

Independent Variable: Learning Style Instrument (CLSI)

A large number of instruments currently exist to measure learning style. Cornett (1983), for example, provides a selected bibliography of thirty different learning style instruments. While a large number of instruments currently exist, not all are compatible or appropriate for the present investigation. Because it is a true measure of learning style preferences, the Canfield Learning Styles Inventory (CLSI) is superior to the commonly used Kolb Learning Styles Inventory (LSI) which is more often characterized as a measure of cognitive learning styles (see, for example, O'Brien, 1994).

Description of the CLSI

The S-A version of the Canfield (1980) Learning Styles Inventory (CLSI) was chosen for use in this investigation. The S-A form has thirty items that provide scores for the twenty measures. Because it is a true measure of learning style (as defined earlier), the CLSI is superior to the commonly used Kolb Learning Styles Inventory (LSI) which is more often characterized as a cognitive measure. The CLSI consists of four dimensions or subscales. Table 1 presents labels and descriptions for the dimensions and subscales as well as the subjects' mean score for each subscale.

The first dimension is *Conditions*. Approximately two-fifths of the items in the inventory are designed to elicit information regarding student motivation for learning within certain classroom conditions. The conditions dimension is

Table 1
Descriptions and means for Learning Style Measures*

CONDITIONS: The first eight scores reflect concerns for the dynamics of the situation in which learning occurs. They cover eight score areas:		
P.	PEER: Working in student teams; good relations with other students; having student friends; etc.	14.92
O	ORGANIZATION: Course work logically and clearly organized; meaningful assignments and sequence of activities.	11.47
G.	GOAL SETTING; Setting one's own objectives; using feedback to modify goals or procedures; making one's own decisions on objectives	15.51
C.	COMPETITION: Desiring comparison with others; needing to know how one is doing in relation to others.	18.06
N.	INSTRUCTOR: Knowing the instructor personally; having a mutual understanding; liking one another.	12.02
D.	DETAIL: Specific information on assignments; requirements, rules, etc.	12.82
I.	INDEPENDENCE: Working alone and independently; determining one's own study plan; doing things for oneself.	17.69
A.	AUTHORITY: Desiring classroom discipline and maintenance of order; having informed and knowledgeable instructors.	17.53
CONTENT: Major areas of interest:		
N.	NUMERIC: Working with numbers and logic; computing; solving mathematical problems, etc.	17.62
Q.	QUALITATIVE: Working with words or language; writing; editing; talking.	13.87
I.	INANIMATE: Working with things; building; repairing; designing; operating.	16.28
P.	PEOPLE: Working with People, interviewing, counseling, selling, helping.	12.25

MODE: General modality through which learning is preferred		
L.	LISTENING: Hearing information; lectures, tapes, speeches, etc.	13.56
R.	READING: Examining the written work; reading texts, pamphlets, etc.	18.79
I.	ICONIC: Viewing illustrations, movies, slides, pictures, graphs, etc.	13.70
D.	DIRECT EXPERIENCE: Handling or performing: shop, laboratory, field trips, practice exercises, etc.	13.92
EXPECTATION: The level of performance anticipated.		
A.	An outstanding or superior level.	14.17
B.	An above average or good level.	9.54
C.	An average or satisfactory level.	14.48
D.	A below average or unsatisfactory level	21.87

*Brief description of the Dimensions are taken from Canfield (1980)

important because the "scores reflect concerns for the dynamics of the situation in which learning occurs" (Canfield, 1980, 22). Since the learning situation in a PSI taught course is different from the traditional classroom, it seems important to include the "Conditions" measures.

The second dimension, *Content*, measures student comparative levels of interest in different types of course content. Six items in the inventory gather information on four major areas of interest in course material: number or mathematical, qualitative or verbal, inanimate or manipulative, and people or interactive.

The third dimension, *Mode,* measures student preference for four different learning modes: listening or auditory, reading, iconics, and direct experiences with subject matter. Questions gathering data for this dimension focus on the student's preferences in the way in they learn the course

content. Since the PSI approach relies heavily on the written word, student attitudes toward the "Reading" and "Listening" modes of learning would seem to be very important for satisfaction and success within the PSI format. Additionally, speeches presented in class represent an example of the "Direct Experience" mode of learning. Preferences for this method of learning would logically seem to influence both academic performance and attitudes toward the course. Information concerning the subjects preferences for the four modes of instruction should provide useful information.

The final dimension, *Expectations,* measures the level of performance the students expect of themselves. This dimension consists of four measures, each of which corresponds to a level of performance: an outstanding or superior level; an above average or good level; an average or satisfactory level; and a below average or unsatisfactory level.

Reliability and Validity of the CLSI

Measures of the reliability for the CLSI currently exist. Research by Omen and Brainard (as reported in Canfield, 1980) found split half reliabilities ranging from .97 to .99 for first half versus second half and ranging from .96 to .99 in the odd number vs. even number comparisons. Conti and Fellenz's (1986) reassessment of the Canfield instrument found it to be reliable. They used Cronback's alpha to determine reliability coefficients and found that while their numbers were not as strong as those reported earlier, most of the measures were either at, above or very near the commonly used criterion level of .70.

According to Merritt (1985), "Canfield (1980) described the validity by presenting findings from various studies that demonstrated statistically significant differences ($p < .05$ or .01) between groups of students enrolled in various majors in collegiate settings" (p. 369). Conti and Fellenz's (1986) inves-

tigation of the Canfield instrument confirmed the content validity, supporting the notion that the instrument does, indeed, measure what it purports to measure. They did find some weakness in the area of construct validity, noting that their analysis found a variety of constructs somewhat different from those labelled in existing scales. They concluded that, "Despite the criticisms [presented in their investigation], the CLSI remains a very useable instrument for rationalistic studies" (p. 75). Additionally, Gruber and Carriuolo (1991) conducted three studies of the construction and validity of both the student and instructor version of the CLSI and found support for both forms.

Dependent Measures – Academic Performance

Three measures of academic achievement were used to determine both cognitive and behavioral performance. The academic performance information was retrieved from the student's class file. The student's file is updated throughout the semester and includes their performance on every element of the course. From the file the following information was retrieved:

(1) *Score on the final exam* — Each student is allowed to take the final exam two times. The 48-item multiple choice examination contains questions from all the units covered over the course of the term. The tests are randomly created by the computer using the question pool available. However, for the purposes of this investigation, each student took the same test the first time, and only the score from the first test was used in the data analysis. Computer analysis of the items on the exam on the first exam was conducted, and those items with poor discrimination were not considered in determining the students score.

(2) *Scores on the required speeches* — The scores on the speeches is a phenomenon that is very unique to the use of

PSI in speech communication. Students have the opportunity to do each of the three required speeches two times. The first time they can receive a grade of "E" (excellent), "A" (acceptable), or "U" (unacceptable). If students choose to give their speech a second time, they can receive the same three grades as above or a fourth grade, "A+" (acceptable plus), which falls between an "E" and an "A". The best grade achieved is recorded in the students' folders and the following points are assigned for each of the grades: E = 20 points; A+ = 15 points; A = 10 points; U = 0 points. This investigation used a composite score for the three presentations. These scores range from a low of 0 to a high of 60.

(3) *Final Course Grade* — The final course grades were coded using the following scale: A+=1, A=2, B+=3, B=4, C+=5, C=6, D+=7, D=8, and F=9. The grading scale at the university offering the course under analysis does not allow the instructor to assign a "minus" grade.

PROCEDURES

The Canfield Learning Style Inventory (CLSI), a brief questionnaire collecting demographic and descriptive information, and appropriate answer/coding sheets were included in the course syllabus given to each student at the beginning of the term. The students completed the demographic and descriptive data during the first week of class. Their responses on the CLSI were completed during the third week of the term. Information on the measures of academic achievement were collected at the end of the term.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Stepwise, multiple regression was chosen for statistical analysis. Pedhazur (1982, p. 6) notes that multiple regression

analysis "is eminently suited for analyzing the collective and separate effect of two or more independent variables on a dependent variable." The twenty measures of the CLSI (independent variables) were regressed by each of the three dependent measures of academic achievement.

Pedhazur (1982) noted that ANOVA can be treated as a special case of multiple regression. However, multiple regression ". . . is applicable to designs in which the variables are continuous, categorical, or combinations of both, thereby eschewing the inappropriate or undesirable practice of categorizing continuous variables . . . in order to fit them in what is considered, often erroneously, an ANOVA design" (p. 7). Since the variables under analysis were continuous in nature, regression is a more appropriate measure because there is no need to develop artificial categories. Multivariate analysis was rejected because the dependent measures were so interrelated.

While all 521 subjects provided a majority of the information necessary for the investigation, occasionally subjects would not provide information concerning specific variables. Those subjects missing any information were not included in the regression run. The actual number of subjects (number of cases) for each regression run is reported in the tables.

RESULTS

Description of Subject Demographics

Subjects were asked to provide demographic information (sex, age, GPA, and grade level) to help generate an accurate profile. The demographic characteristics of the 521 respondents correspond to those of "traditional" college students. For example, the gender balance between the men (N=245, 47%) and women (N=276, 53%) was nearly equal.

As expected for a freshman-level introductory speech communication course, the subjects in this study were far from even in terms of their current grade level. The vast majority of the subjects were freshman (N=307, 58.9%) and sophomores (N= 129, 24.8%); with the remaining juniors (N=54, 10.4%) and seniors (N=31, 6.0%) comprising a much smaller percentage.

Since so many of the subjects were at the freshman or sophomore level, it's not surprising that the vast majority of the subjects reported being eighteen (N=168, 32.2%), nineteen (N=180, 34.5%), twenty (N=84, 16.1%) or twenty-one (N=31, 6.0%). Of the remaining subjects, 55 (10.6%) were 22 or older and three people (0.6%) did not provide an age.

Subjects were asked to provide their college GPA on the 4.0 scale. Those subjects in their first semester of college were instructed to use their high school GPA. The subjects' self-reported GPA ranged from a low of .5 to a high of 4.0. The mean (2.94), median (3.0) and mode (3.0), are all around 3.0 on the 4.0 scale.

Description of Subject Scores on CLSI

An additional way of describing the subjects is to delineate their scores on the learning style preference instrument. Table 1 (presented earlier) provides the mean score for each of the twenty measures. The scoring of the scales is such that the lower the score the more important the measure is to the student. Thus, CLSI items 18, 2 and 5 are the most important items for the students in the subject sample. Item 18 is one of the expectancy measures. According to these results, most students expect to be in the above average category. Students expressed a desire for the course to be clearly organized (item 2), as well as a desire to know and understand their instructor (item 5). These results are significant because the PSI format requires extensive structure and

organization, and this organization is clearly outlined for the students. In addition, the "personalized" system of instruction is rooted in the notion that the students develop a "personal" relationship with their undergraduate peer teacher.

The highest mean scores (thus those considered least important by the subjects) were for items 20 (below average expectation), 14 (reading) and 4 (competition). These are also significant in the PSI format because they indicate that students do not desire competition with other students in the class (CLSI-4), and that students do not wish to learn through reading (CLSI-14). It is not surprising that few students expressed an expectation to be below average.

In the PSI format the students are graded on a point scale; there is no inherent competition among the students. Thus, the PSI format supports the student's desire to avoid such competition. However, the rejection of reading as a mode of learning is important because the PSI system is developed around the concept of learning through reading at an individualized pace. The fact that the learning style measure of reading preferences received the highest mean score indicates that the subjects do not prefer using reading to learn, and this is the primary method of learning used in the PSI format.

Academic Achievement

Three dependent measures were used to determine the affect of the independent variables upon academic achievement: final exam score, composite speech score and final course grade.

Final Exam Score — Table 2 presents the results of the regression run with the final exam score as the dependent measure. Five of the twenty learning style preferences were significant for this equation, and they explained approximately 15% of the variance.

Table 2
Stepwise Regression for Final Exam Score - Dependent

		VARIABLES ENTERED INTO THE EQUATION						
Step	Variable	MULTR	R2	ADJ R2	F	SIGF	Beta In	Correl
1	CLSI-17 (Outstanding)	.2297	.0898	.0879	45.113	.000	–.2997	–.2997
2	CLSI-2 (Organization)	.3345	.1119	.1080	28.726	.000	–.1485	–.1509
3	CLSI-9 (Numeric)	.3534	.1249	.1191	21.639	.000	–.1171	–.1844
4	CLSI-10 (Qualitative)	.3705	.1373	.1297	18.057	.000	–.1268	–.0445
5	CLSI-18 (Above Ave.)	.3856	.1487	.1393	15.824	.000	–.1110	–.1246

N = 458

The correlations are all negative. Since the coding of the learning style measures was the opposite of that for the final exam, those students who expressed a stronger preference for the five significant learning style preferences, would be expected to receive higher scores on the final examination. Thus, those students with expectations of superior (CLSI-17) or above average (CLSI-18) performance in the course did better on the exam. The students scoring higher on the exam also expressed greater preference for clear organization (CLSI-2) and numeric (CLSI-9) or qualitative (CLSI-10) course content. Since qualitative course content includes material on communication, it is not surprising that it correlates with success on the final exam.

Composite Speech Score — In the introduction to speech communication course under investigation an important element of academic achievement centers on the understanding of public speaking as evidenced by speech performance. Table 3 presents the frequency counts for the composite

Table 3
Frequencies and Percentages for Composite Speech Scores

Score	Frequency	Percentage
20	7	1.3%
25	6	1.2%
30	24	4.6%
35	21	4.0%
40	62	11.9%
45	42	8.1%
50	109	20.9%
55	80	15.4%
60	124	23.8%
Missing	46	8.8%
	521	100.0%

speech scores. The grading system used in this course is such that the composite scores could be zero or between ten and sixty (inclusive) in increments of five. The results indicate that 60.1% of the students fell into the top three values.

Table 4 presents the summary information for the stepwise regression using the dependent variable of composite speech grade. Four of the learning style preference measures were significant when regressed with the composite speech score. Again, all of the correlations were negative. Since the scoring of the of learning style preferences is in the opposite direction of the composite speech score, the negative correlations actually indicate a positive relationship.

Those students expressing expectations of superior performance (CLSI-17) in the course were more likely to have a high composite speech grade. Additionally, expressing a desire to know the instructor (CLSI-5) and have a clear class organization (CLSI-2) were more likely to do well on the speeches. Finally, those individuals expressing a desire for course content which focused on people (CLSI-12) were more likely to have a higher composite speech score.

Final Course Grade — The previously conducted analysis used two measures of academic achievement; one was the final test score and the other was the composite speech score. However, there was no overall measure of success. Thus, the final grade was incorporated as an all-encompassing measure of achievement.

Table 5 presents the results for the stepwise regression with the final course grade as the dependent variable. The coding of learning style preferences and final course grade were in the same direction. Three variables were significant in this regression. Two of the measures deal with the student's expectations. Thus, students expressing expectations of superior performance in the class (CLSI-17) were more likely to receive a higher final course grade. And, not surprisingly, those students who expected to have a below average performance in the course received lower final course

Table 4
Stepwise Regression for Composite Speech Score - Dependent

		VARIABLES ENTERED INTO THE EQUATION						
Step	Variable	MULTR	R2	ADJ R2	F	SIGF	Beta In	Correl
1	CLSI-17 (Outstanding)	.2736	.0749	.0729	37.461	.000	–.2736	–.2736
2	CLSI-2 (Instructor)	.3061	.0937	.0898	23.888	.000	–.1374	–.1342
3	CLSI-2 (Organization)	.3269	.1069	.1011	18.391	.000	–.1177	–.0834
4	CLSI-12 (People)	.3395	.1153	.1076	14.984	.000	–.0937	–.1230

N = 464

Table 5
Stepwise Regression for Final Course Grade - Dependent

		VARIABLES ENTERED INTO THE EQUATION						
Step	Variable	MULTR	R2	ADJ R2	F	SIGF	Beta In	Correl
1	CLSI-17 (Outstanding)	.3461	.1198	.1179	63.025	.000	.3461	.3461
2	CLSI-2 (Instructor)	.3813	.1454	.1417	39.287	.000	.1598	.1623
3	CLSI-20 (Below Ave.)	.4002	.1602	.1547	29.305	.000	−.1490	−.3191

N = 464

grades. The desire for clear organization of course materials (CLSI-2) again showed up as a significant correlate with academic performance. Those students expressing a greater desire for such organization, were more likely to receive higher course grades.

DISCUSSION

Twenty measures of learning style preferences were regressed with each of three measures of academic achievement. Table 6 has been created to facilitate discussion of the results for the three regression runs which used measures of academic achievement as the dependent variable. The table summarizes the results for Tables 2, 4 and 5 presented earlier. The summary is helpful because it provides a quick visual reference to the results.

Two measures clearly have the greatest correlation with a student's academic achievement: a preference for strong organization of class materials (CLSI-2) and an expectation of superior performance (CLSI-17). Both of these measures were found in the regression equations for all three measures of academic achievement in the course. Both measures have a positive correlation with the measures of academic success. Thus, those students expressing a desire for clear classroom organization and expressing an expectation of superior performance are more likely to do better on the final exam, the speeches, and the entire course.

Another conclusion one can draw from Table 6 is that the entire mode dimension had no significant connection with student achievement in the course under investigation. Thus, it appears that preferences for the method of information dissemination had no significant effect on the students' academic achievement. This is significant because it means that individual instructors should feel less pressure to change

Table 6
Summary of Significant Relationships in Regression Runs

CSLI #	Measure	Dependent Variable (Table #	Direction[a]
CONDITIONS DIMENSION			
1.	Peer	--	--
2.	Organization	Final Exam Score (2)	Positive
		Composite Speech Score (4)	Positive
		Final Course Grade (5)	Positive
3.	Goal Setting	--	--
4.	Competition	--	--
5.	Instructor	Composite Speech Score (4)	Positive
6.	Detail	--	--
7.	Independence	--	--
8.	Authority	--	--
CONTENT DIMENSION			
9.	Numeric	Final Exam Score (2)	Positive
10.	Qualitative	Final Exam Score (2)	Positive
11.	Inanimate	--	--
12.	People	Composite Speech Score (4)	Positive
MODE DIMENSION			
13.	Listening	--	--
14.	Reading	--	--
15.	Iconic	--	--
16.	Direct Experience	--	--
EXPECTATION DIMENSION			
17.	Outstanding	Final Exam Score (2)	Positive
		Composite Speech Score (4)	Positive
		Final Course Grade (5)	Positive
18.	Above Average	Final Exam Score (2)	Positive
19.	Average	--	--
20.	Below Average	Final Course Grade (5)	Negative

a The direction is the true direction of the relationship. It was not taken from the tables. Thus, the coding scheme of the variables has been taken into account.

the method of information presentation in order to meet the students' desires. The failure of mode dimension measures to show up as significantly related to performance is especially interesting since earlier research found that students did not like to read (CLSI-14) from textbooks but they did like listening (CLSI-13) to the ideas of other students (Hinton, 1992).

Finally, the expectation dimension appears to be significantly correlated with the students' academic achievement in the course. In fact, of the twelve instances where a measure of learning style was significant in a regression equation, five were from the four measures of expectancy. This is not surprising in light of past academic performance. Some may argue that student expectations are based on the reality of their past performance. Others might argue that the expectations are creating a self-fulfilling prophecy, which guides the student's performance in the course. Future investigations may focus more closely on the role of expectations in academic achievement.

Limitations of the Study

This investigation has two limitations related to the use of speech scores as a dependent measure. The first limitation concerns the lack of differentiation in the composite speech scores. While the scores fell into nine categories, nearly two-thirds of the valid scores were in the top three categories. There is no statistical evidence that this effected the results. However, a method of speech scoring which allows for greater diversity, might encourage more independent variables to enter the regression equations.

The second limitation also deals with the speech rating system. The course under investigation uses the undergraduate instructors (IA's) to evaluate the speeches. This means that there are approximately fifty different individuals doing the rating of the speeches. Fewer raters might have

increased the reliability of the scores. However, the course under investigation has several built in mechanisms to increase reliability. First, all the undergraduate instructors receive extensive training for the evaluation process. Secondly, the rating sheets have specific categories for the evaluation of the speaker, and the categories allow extremely limited flexibility for the rater. Analytic rating forms such as the ones used in this investigation have been shown to be reliable by previous researchers (Goulden, 1994). Goulden, for example, reports an interrater reliability score of .8535 for fifteen raters using an analytic evaluation form.

Practical Applications for Instructors

The results of the current investigation offer instructors some insight into the importance of learning style preferences. Additionally, the results offer the following two practical applications for basic communication instructors.

Identification of Learning Style Preferences Influencing Success

Speech communication instructors tend to focus on variables like communication apprehension because they are specific or more unique to the communication course. However, broader education issues, such as learning style, can impact student success in all courses, including communication courses. Previous research has demonstrated the importance of learning style preferences on the academic performance of student at all age levels and in a wide variety of subjects (Enochs, Handley & Wollenberg, 1986; McDermott, 1984; Miller, Alway & McKinley, 1987).

The results of this investigation demonstrate that basic course instructors need to consider learning style preferences

in their classes. In this investigation, eight of the twenty preferences were significant in regression equations with measures of academic success (see Table 6). Instructors should pay particular attention to these eight variables. For example, student expectations are positively connected with success in the course. The higher the expectation, the better the student does in the course. It may be possible for instructors to indicate that success in the basic communication course is not dependent on past academic experience because its "unique" content. Additionally, student preference for organization was significant with all three measures of course success. Thus, it is important for the instructor to be extremely organized and for the student to be aware of use that organization.

Identification of Learning Style Preferences Important to Basic Communication Course Students

The Mean scores for the 20 learning style measures (presented on Table 1) pinpoint those measures which are more important to the students in the current investigation. Instructors may wish to modify their teaching styles so that teaching styles are more in line with the student learning styles. Clearly the students in the current investigation can not be representative of students everywhere, so some instructors may wish to use learning style measures to assess the preferences of their own students.

The students in this investigation expressed the greatest desire for a logical and clear organization of the course, knowing the instructor on a personal basis and being given specific information on assignments, requirements, etc. Basic communication course structures providing the organization, personal contact and detail, will likely be viewed much more favorably than those that do not. Instructors who can not

alter the course to match the preferences of students may attempt to teach students how to manage their selection of the various learning styles available to them (Miller, Alway & McKinley, 1987).

Student preferences for the learning environment are not simply a matter of comfort. They influence academic success and perceptions of the course. As an area of academic research, learning styles has received the attention of many education scholars, but has been virtually ignored in the speech communication discipline. A few papers and research articles (for example, Bourhis & Berquist, 1990; Bourhis & Stubbs, 1991; and Schliessmann, 1987) have discussed the importance of learning styles in the basic speech communication course, but they pale in comparison to the plethora of articles on communication apprehension. This investigation offers an initial effort to determine the role of learning style preferences in the basic communication course. Future investigation may study the influence of learning style preferences in basic courses using a different structure.

REFERENCES

Andrews, J. D. W. (1981). Teaching format and student style: Their interactive effects on learning. *Research in Higher Education, 14,* 161-178.

Armstrong, N. (1981). The relationship between learning preference style and student evaluation of teaching. *Journal of the Association for the Study of Perception, 16,* 27-30.

Barbe, W. & Swassing, R. H. (1979). *Teaching through modality strengths: Concepts and practices.* Columbus, OH: Zaner-Bloser.

Bonham, L. A. (1988a). Learning style instruments: Let the buyer beware. *Lifelong Learning, 11,* 12-16.

Bonham, L. A. (1988b). Learning style use: In need of perspective. *Lifelong Learning, 11,* 14-17.

Bourhis, J. & Berquist, C. (1990). Communication apprehension in the basic course: Learning styles and preferred instructional strategies of high and low apprehensive students. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 3,* 27-46.

Bourhis, J. & Stubbs, J. (1991). *Communication apprehension, learning styles, and academic achievement.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago.

Campbell, B. J. (1991). Planning for a student learning style. *Journal of Education for Business, 66,* 356-359.

Canfield, A. A. (1980). *Learning styles inventory manual.* Ann Arbor, MI: Humanics Inc.

Carrell, P. L. & Monroe, L. B. (1993). Learning styles and composition. *Modern Language Journal, 77,* 148-162.

Clariana, R. B. & Smith, L. (1988). *Learning style shifts in computer-assisted instructional settings.* A Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Clements, Z. J. (1976). Taking all students from where they really are. *NASSP Bulletin, 60,* 104-108.

Conti, G. J. & Fellenz, R. A. (1986). Reassessing the Canfield learning style inventory. In Keneston Landers (Ed.), *Exchanging at the crossroads ... research and practice. Program and Proceedings for the annual adult education research conference* (pp. 72-76). Syracuse, NY.

Corbett, S. S. & Smith, W. F. (1984). Identifying student learning styles: Proceed with caution! *The Modern Language Journal, 68,* 212-221.

Cornett, C. E. (1983). *What you should know about teaching and learning styles.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Davidson, G. V. (1992). How do learning styles relate to performance in a computer applications course? *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 24,* 384-358.

Dunn, R., Beaudry, J. S. & Klavas, A. (1989). Survey of research on learning styles. Educational Leadership, 50-58.

Enns, C. Z. (1993). Integrating separate and connected knowing: The experiential learning model. *Teaching of Psychology, 20,* 7-13.

Enochs, J. R., Handley, H. M. & Wollenberg, J. P. (1986). Relating learning styles, reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and aptitude for learning to achievement in self-paced and computer assisted instructional modes. *Journal of Experimental Education, 54,* 135-139.

Frymier, J. (1977). *Annehurst curriculum classification system.* West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Gorham, J. (1986). Assessment, clarification and implications of learning styles in instructional interactions. *Communication Education, 35,* 411-417.

Goulden, N. R. (1994). Relationship of analytic and holistic methods to raters' scores for speeches. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education, 27,* 73-82.

Gruber, C. P. & Carriuolo, N. (1991). Construction and preliminary validation of a learner typology for the Canfield learning styles inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51,* 839-855.

Hinton, S. (1992). *The learning style preferences of students in graduate school.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Knoxville, TN.

Holtzclaw, L. R. (1985). Adult learners' preferred learning styles, choice of courses, and subject areas for prior experiential learning credit. *Lifelong Learning, 8,* 23-27.

Jacobs, R. L. (1982). *The relationship of cognitive style to the frequency of proctor/student interactions and achievement in a PSI course.* 8 p. ED 223 223.

James, W. B. & Galbraith, M. W. (1985). Perceptual learning styles: Implications and techniques for the practitioner. *Lifelong Learning, 8,* 20-23.

Korhonen, L. J. & McCall, R. J. (1986). The interaction of learning style and learning environment on adult achievement. *Lifelong Learning, 10,* 21-23.

McDermott, P. A. (1984). Comparative functions of preschool learning style and IQ in predicting future academic performance. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 9,* 38-47.

Meighan, S. (1985). We put learning styles to work in our school, and you can too. *The American School Board Journal, 172,* 30-31,39.

Melear, C. T. & Pitchford, F. (1991). African-American science student learning style. In *Proceedings of the International Conference of the Association for Psychological Type.* Richmond, VA.

Merritt, S. L. (1985). Learning style preferences of baccalaureate nursing students. *Nursing Research, 32,* 367-372.

Miller, C. D., Alway, M. & McKinley, D. L. (1987). Effects of learning styles and strategies on academic success. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28,* 399-404.

O'Brien, T. P. (1994). Cognitive learning styles and academic achievement in secondary education. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 28,* 11-21.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction.* 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pettigrew, F. E. & Buell, C. (1989). Preservice and experienced teachers' ability to diagnose learning styles. *Journal of Educational Research, 82,* 187-189.

Riechmann-Hruska, S. (1989). Learning styles and individual differences in learning. *Equity & Excellence, 24,* 25-27.

Schliessmann, M. R. (1987). *Cultural differences and learning style in the basic course.* Paper presented at the 1987 basic course directors conference, Detroit.

Schroeder, C. C. (1993). New students — New learning styles. *Change, 25,* 21-26.

Skipper, C. E. (1992). *Five instructors — A study of instructional preferences of preservice teachers.* A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Snow, R. E. (1986). Individual differences and the design of educational programs. *American Psychologist, 41,* 1029-1039.

Soroko, M. P. (1988). Student learning styles: A teaching consideration in principles of accounting courses. *Journal of Education for Business, 63,* 248-250.

Torres, R. M. & Cano, J. (1994). Learning styles of students in a college of agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 35,* 61-66.

Willett, L. H. & Adams, F. G. (1985). Learning style preferences of external degree students. *Innovative Higher Education, 10,* 55-65.

Williams, E. H., Morris, N. T., Newman, P. P., Williams, A. A. & Wesley, A. L. (1989). What can we learn from the learning styles of developmental students? *Reading Improvement, 26,* 281-289.

Graduate Teaching Assistant Training: Preparing Instructors to Assist ESL Students in the Introductory Public Speaking Course

Brooke L. Quigley
Katherine G. Hendrix
Karen Freisem

Among the challenges faced by today's communication educators is the need to respond effectively to a diverse student population (Braithwaite & Braithwaite, 1991; Shankar, 1993; Webster, 1993; Zimmerman, 1995). Graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), who are among those who often teach the basic communication course, experience this challenge and must find ways to adapt their teaching. One aspect of cultural diversity which GTAs must be able to address is their undergraduate students' very different proficiencies in spoken English, especially those students for whom English is a Second Language (ESL). ESL students include, among others, resident non-native English speakers (students whose families were originally from another country but who now have established permanent U.S. residency), and international students (students residing in the United States only during programs of study). Along with other types of diversity issues in instruction, basic communication course directors are often called upon to prepare GTAs to assist ESL students enrolled in courses that require significant oral assignments.

That oral assignments pose challenges to all students, many of whom are apprehensive about speaking, has been repeatedly documented (Cronin, 1986; Ellis, 1995; McCroskey,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1977, 1984; McKinney & Pullum, 1994). Oral assignments pose particular challenges for some (though clearly not all) ESL students, who rely on their communication experience with native speakers to facilitate adjustment to and success within a new culture (Zimmerman, 1995). Educators have addressed the issue of assisting ESL students in a variety of ways: by identifying the academic needs and concerns of groups of students (Ferris & Tagg, 1996; Yook & Seiler, 1990), by enrolling students in special courses designated solely for ESL individuals prior to their enrollment in basic communication courses with native speakers (Murphy, 1992; 1993), and by promoting instruction designed to improve oral communication skills (Meloni & Thompson, 1980).

Much of the research in our field that addresses the needs of ESL students relies on the general strategy of providing a separate or special class where ESL students get significant individual attention and are able to learn in a context of other students with very similar needs. Students in these classes may also have the benefit of instructors with specialized training in teaching students for whom English is not the primary language. While this learning environment can be optimal in some respects, ESL enrollment at many campuses may not justify the creation of special sections of courses designed just for them. Additionally, there may be important advantages for ESL students who enroll in typical university classes where they encounter a variety of native speakers on a regular basis (Zimmerman, 1995). However, such a classroom setting frequently includes a majority of U.S. born, native-English speaking students and only one or two ESL students. The instructor in this setting usually does not have specialized training for working with ESL students. Thus, one need that is beginning to be addressed more frequently in communication pedagogy is the question of how instructors who do not have ESL training, including GTAs, can assist ESL students in this "mixed" classroom setting.

In this article, we add to the effort to assist instructors in the mixed classroom by identifying ways course directors can prepare GTAs to work effectively with ESL students. The strategies identified, which are drawn from descriptions of specialized communication classes for ESL students and from the experience of instructors of traditionally mixed classes, address two general areas of GTA preparation. The first area of preparation focuses on the assessment of ESL students' oral proficiency. The steps identified offer course directors and GTAs who may not have specialized training in ESL one means of assessing a student's preparedness to be in a regular public speaking class. The second area of preparation focuses on instructional strategies which can be used by GTAs when it is determined that an ESL student is appropriately enrolled in a class, yet still may need some specific assistance. We begin first by describing the context of the introductory public speaking course at our university and by identifying the communication principles and teaching goals that serve as a foundation for the course and a guide for the development of instructional strategies.

COURSE CONTEXT, PRINCIPLES AND GOALS

We recognize that the content and focus of basic public speaking courses varies from campus to campus. Yet, there are also commonalties. After briefly describing our particular course context, we identify the communication principles and course goals that influence our teaching and are likely to be common to many introductory public speaking courses in our discipline.

Course Context

Our beginning public speaking course is a general education requirement at a Southern, urban, commuter university with an undergraduate enrollment of 20,000. The university is located in a diverse metropolitan area with a population of approximately one million and a student body drawn predominantly from the surrounding community and the state. Although full-time faculty teach the basic course, the approximately forty-two sections offered each semester are taught primarily by GTAs or part-time instructors. The GTAs have full responsibility for all aspects of their two assigned classes; these responsibilities range from lecture preparation and exam construction to assessment of the students' oral and written work and computation of the students' final grades.

The public speaking course at our university examines the nature and practice of public speaking and its role in civic life. The course is designed so that GTAs, as well as other instructors, teach public speaking skills while also exploring the ethical responsibilities of speakers and analyzing the influence of messages encountered through media presentations such as television news, talk radio, billboard advertising, and internet sites. Since the course is a general education requirement, students are drawn from all disciplines. The 25-student, introductory-level course typically consists of individuals who range from first-term freshman to graduating seniors. An enrollment of African American students that approximates 20% results in visible diversity in the campus population. Another type of diversity is represented by ESL students, whose numbers at the undergraduate level on the campus are quite small. According to the campus International Student Office, undergraduates represented 30% of international students on the campus in the 1995-96 academic year, for a total of 167 students. In this type of academic context, some ESL students, whether they are U.S.

born or international, might feel not only intimidated but quite isolated.

Communication Principles

As with other introductory courses in public speaking, ours combines a theoretic understanding of the communication process with practical advice based on the students' speaking performance. Even though the basic course can range from a large lecture format with GTA-instructed lab sections to smaller public speaking classes combining interpersonal and/or small group communication, the principles of communication that serve as the foundation for these courses are often similar. Three principles of communication that help define our course, are common to many courses and appear in a variety of contemporary and widely used public speaking texts: 1) effective public communication begins with a strong sense of confidence and commitment grounded in the speaker's identification of a purpose for speaking and a message to be delivered; 2) public speaking is most usefully conceived of as a dynamic process that is interactive and rhetorical in nature, and 3) speakers in our culture typically are seen as effective when their delivery is extemporaneous (see, for example, Beebe & Beebe, 1994; Lucas, 1995; Nelson & Pearson, 1996; Osborn & Osborn, 1997; Sprague & Stuart, 1996).

Instructors may sometimes be tempted to diminish the importance of these communication principles when working with ESL students, focusing primarily on ESL students' proficiency with spoken English. While some students' oral English may indeed be an important issue, it also may be the case that these students will increase their effectiveness significantly by preparing with the stated communication principles in mind. ESL students, like all students, will be more effective if they begin by having a clear message to

which they are personally committed; they will help overcome language difficulties or other barriers to understanding by recognizing the challenges of speaking as interactive and rhetorical; and they will increase their chances of success by practicing the extemporaneous mode of speaking. It is therefore important that instructors address issues of pronunciation when necessary, but also address ESL students' understanding of the speaking event as grounded in these communication principles.

Course Goals

Many public speaking courses, ours included, focus on the knowledge and communication skills students will need as they prepare for other courses, seek or maintain employment, volunteer in their communities, and participate as active members of an informed public. Instructors will often have goals for student learning which include: understanding the need for public speaking in political, social, and employment contexts; understanding the process by which one researches, prepares and delivers effective speeches appropriate to particular situations; developing sustained and coherent lines of argument in defense of given positions; demonstrating the skills of effective and ethical public speaking in the classroom setting; and practicing the skills of effective listening and critical appraisal of information and opinions offered in classroom speeches. In some public speaking courses, such as our own, the course content may also deal with issues of freedom of expression, responsibilities of communication in public life, and with the impact of media influences on communication in today's society (Hendrix, Allensworth & Marton, 1996; Quigley, Hendrix, Aoki & Matthews, in press).

These goals for student learning are appropriate for all students enrolled in the basic course, including ESL students. However, GTAs and other instructors may find it helpful to

consider several additional goals that would be specific to their ESL students. In the public speaking course, additional goals that would be appropriate for ESL students include: recognizing aspects of their speech fluency that make comprehension difficult for native-speaking listeners (such as unusual pausing or inaccurate stress of syllables); gaining familiarity with U.S. idiomatic expressions and audience expectations; and developing skills for speaking directly and assertively. These goals are consistent with the principles that guide many communication courses and are complementary with a variety of general goals for student learning. Both the general and specific goals for student learning identified here can help guide GTAs and other instructors as they work with ESL students in the setting of the regular public speaking course.

When offering assistance to students, and particularly to ESL students enrolled in the course at our university, we work from several assumptions. First, we acknowledge that cultural differences among students constitute a valuable resource for learning and we look for opportunities to enhance all students' appreciation of such a resource (Hill & Javidi, 1993). The benefit of such opportunities becomes clear when students are encouraged to share something of their cultural background through oral and written assignments. Second, we recognize that the direct, conversational style of public speaking that we teach is culturally based. We therefore acknowledge that this style, though highly successful for the requirements of U.S. business, political, academic, social and civic life, is not necessarily appropriate to all cultures or even to all contexts in the U.S. We strive to teach students to understand this direct speaking style without diminishing the importance or integrity of any student's own cultural background. Third, as instructors we assume that the most useful strategies for assisting ESL students are those which do not point out any particular student in the class, but are strategies whereby the instructor works with a student indi-

vidually, or are strategies that are effective for the whole class and are therefore directed to everyone.

In the following sections, we discuss the two areas of GTA preparation already identified. First we suggest steps that course directors and GTAs can take to assess an ESL student's oral proficiency early in the term to determine whether the student should remain in the course. Second, in keeping with the communication principles and goals for student learning already discussed, we highlight some instructional strategies for assisting ESL students to do the following: increase their confidence in speaking by recognizing aspects of their fluency that make comprehension difficult for native-speaking listeners and becoming more effective in the areas of pronunciation, comprehensibility and listening; to increase their skill in thinking rhetorically by gaining greater knowledge of U.S. idiomatic expressions and audience expectations; and to demonstrate more effective extemporaneous speaking by practicing direct and assertive delivery skills.

ASSESSMENT STEPS

It is important for instructors to know early in a public speaking course whether any of their students will have special difficulty with spoken English. We suggest several informal ways of assessing students' oral skills to determine, well before the first formal or graded speaking assignment, that all students are appropriately enrolled in a course. Such assessment can prevent a negative first speech experience that might be very difficult for the ESL student -- or any student -- to later overcome. GTAs and other instructors can assist ESL students to determine whether they are appropriately enrolled in a class by using the following four steps to diagnose a student's oral English skills.

Diagnosis

PERFORMING INFORMAL DIAGNOSIS

During the first several days of class, many instructors make an initial, informal language proficiency "diagnosis" of all students, by providing ungraded oral assignments that are relatively relaxed and fun, require limited student preparation, and may involve less risk for students who are apprehensive about speaking. Examples of such assignments include: students giving a two-minute introduction of themselves to the class, students introducing a classmate, or students giving short impromptu speeches (for example, by drawing predetermined topics or objects from a common pool). Some of these assignments can be completed with students informally seated in a circle or standing in front of the class. Or, students may work in dyads, with the instructor listening in briefly to each group (Osborn & Osborn, 1997). However the assignment is accomplished, it is essential that the instructor hear each student speak. These exercises provide information regarding which students may require a more careful diagnosis or may need individual assistance before the first formal or graded assignment. Examples of speech patterns that might significantly reduce an ESL student's comprehensibility to native-speaking listeners are: speaking too quickly to be understood; using inaccurate word stress; speaking too slowly while searching for the appropriate English vocabulary; enunciating poorly; and/or pronouncing sounds incorrectly (one common error is to substitute other sounds for "th").

PERFORMING FOLLOW-UP DIAGNOSIS

When there is a student whose speaking is difficult to comprehend, the GTA or the course director can proceed by

obtaining further information about the student's language background and the student's self-perceptions regarding language proficiency. For example, an instructor may want to arrange for the student to come to the office to talk, and use the Suggested Student Survey Questions (see Appendix 1) or a similar set of questions when conferring with the student privately. The questionnaire will help determine, for example, whether the student has opportunities to practice spoken English outside of class -- many international students simply do not have such opportunities. Determining that a student has limited or no opportunities to speak English outside of class will help the GTA or course director prepare to consult with an ESL specialist concerning possible assistance and/or the reasonableness of the student remaining in the class. This information may also help to assess to what degree the student may be apprehensive about being in the class.

Consultation

USING CAMPUS RESOURCES

If it is determined that a student needs assistance or there is a question whether it is appropriate for the student to be enrolled in a regular public speaking class, the course director and GTA can identify and access campus ESL resources. Assistance in assessing a student's oral skills can be requested from staff who work predominantly with ESL students, and who are able to determine whether the student's pronunciation can be improved enough for the student to be successful, given the class assignments and the corresponding deadlines. For some students, the remedy may be as simple as slowing down their speech rate or enunciating more clearly; such remedies for some students can be accomplished through additional work outside of class. An ESL or intensive English specialist might recommend the assignment

of a tutor, a native English speaking conversation partner, a host family, or enrollment in an intensive English course. It may be most appropriate for the student to take the class at a later time, possibly after enrolling in a communication class designed specifically for ESL students, such as the course described by Murphy (1993).

MAKING COLLABORATIVE DECISIONS

Based on information from the initial diagnosis, questionnaire responses, and from the ESL or other language specialist, the GTA can work with the course director to make a collaborative decision about the appropriateness of an ESL student remaining in the class. It is important that clear information is provided to the student so that he or she can also participate in the decision making and can help seek the best solution. In some cases, a student may see the consequences of dropping a class as more negative than struggling through the course and receiving a low or barely passing grade. If it appears the student should not remain in the course, the course director and the GTA may want to discuss positive options available to the student other than enrollment in the course. For example, the ESL student may obtain the materials for the course and work with an ESL specialist, the course director, and/or instructor with the intent of enrolling in the course the following term.

In addition to identifying the positive options available, the director and GTA may discuss: the technical consequences for the student (as viewed by the university) if the course is dropped; appropriate circumstances under which to inform the student of their recommendation; and recommendations to consider if the student insists on remaining in the class. In this latter case, the course director or GTA will need to provide the student with clear information regarding his or her chances for successful completion of the course.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

When relevant parties agree that an ESL student seems well suited to remain in a class, GTAs can use a variety of instructional strategies to help those particular students who need to build oral communication skills. Many of the strategies identified here are already used in communication classes, and just need to be seen as especially important for assisting ESL students. Some strategies identified here have been recommended by colleagues who work primarily with ESL students, while other strategies are cited from texts written specifically for ESL students and their teachers (Dale & Wolf, 1988; Klippel, 1995; Porter & Grant, 1992). An additional reference is Osborn and Osborn's new instructor's annotated edition of *Public Speaking* (1997), offering general teaching tips and ESL teaching tips related to the concepts in each chapter and the supplementary *ESL Teaching Guide* (Marques, 1997). The following instructional strategies are among many that are consistent with the communication principles and course goals already identified. While some of these strategies will assist all students, they may particularly assist the ESL student within the context of the regular public speaking course.

Pronunciation, Comprehensibility, and Listening

There are a variety of ways a non-ESL instructor may be able to help an ESL student build confidence in speaking. One way is by helping the student become aware of aspects of his or her speech fluency and by offering some general assistance, where needed, with pronunciation, comprehensibility and/or listening skills. If the student is also getting assistance out-

side of class, the GTA and/or course director may want to design strategies that are consistent with the outside help.

ASSIGNING PRACTICE PRESENTATIONS

Graduate teaching assistants can create opportunities for all students to give short, ungraded practice presentations. Students, especially those who are reticent, are likely to benefit from assignments that get them speaking early and routinely. This can be accomplished with impromptu speaking, with each student speaking to the entire class. It can also be accomplished by having students engage in pair-work: discussing their speech topics in pairs, orally presenting outlines to a peer, or orally presenting speeches to a peer (Murphy, 1992, 1993). These exercises, often used in special ESL-only classes, will help all students in the mixed class by giving them multiple opportunities to talk about assignments, practice them, receive feedback from a listener, and respond to the feedback. With appropriate guidelines provided, such assignments can give ESL students additional and very valuable opportunities to listen for comprehension and check the accuracy of their comprehension while working with a series of partners. For example, Murphy (1993) suggests that ESL students who are speaking to partners: 1)experiment with different ways of expressing similar ideas; 2)summarize from time to time; 3)look at the listener as much as possible; and, 4)occasionally, ask the listener questions to see if she or he understood.

ENCOURAGING PEER MENTORING

When appropriate, instructors can initiate peer mentoring in the classroom, by determining whether there are native English speaking students in the course who clearly are able and willing to assist their ESL peers (such as within the format of paired assignments, or group assignments that

already occur in the class). GTAs could identify native-speaking students who understand the assignments, typically perform "A" or "B" work, and are capable of explaining their thought process, as potential peer mentors. After locating willing and capable peer mentors, GTAs might then assign ESL students to a native speaking partner as a way for peer mentoring to occur. The progress of the mentoring dyad can then be monitored occasionally throughout the term. A similar type of informal mentoring at the university-wide level is described by Zimmerman (1995) and others who recommend international students be paired with American students in a "buddy" system. In the campus-wide efforts, students from the host country are recruited and trained to help their international peers with their adjustment to a new culture. While U.S. students at the course level would not need to be formally trained, they need to be selected carefully and advised of how they can best be helpful in providing informal information and the opportunity to practice.

RECORDING STUDENTS ON AUDIOTAPE OR VIDEOTAPE

Graduate teaching assistants and other instructors can encourage ESL students to audiotape themselves as they present informally or formally in class or as they speak with the instructor in the office. The students can then listen to the tapes and reflect on which aspects of their speech make them sound like a native speaker of English and which aspects distinguish them as a non-native speaker. If the student chooses to listen to an audiotape with the GTA, together they might be able to determine where pronunciation creates problems for the native-speaking listener. Listening and reflection can help the ESL student practice listening skills as well as pinpoint areas to change in their individual speaking.

If instructors routinely video record all students as part of their class, such recording may be especially helpful for non-native speakers as they complete informal and formal

assignments. As with any use of video, students will benefit from guidance on how to best use this technology to enhance their strengths and identify areas for improvement; without such guidance, students frequently focus too readily on negative aspects of their performance to the exclusion of positive aspects. Although many students can view such recordings on their own and submit a critique of their speaking, others may benefit more from watching their video with an instructor who is trained to provide supportive and constructive feedback. Course directors can assist GTAs with such preparation based on existing models of providing feedback to students in performance courses (Quigley & Nyquist, 1992). As with audio recording, the use of video can help instructors working with ESL students determine at which points in their speaking they are difficult to understand. By using videotape, instructors can also indicate the specific moments in a speech where an ESL student could enhance his or her comprehensibility by reinforcing visually (by writing on the chalkboard or overhead, for example) key terms in the oral presentation.

RECORDING OTHERS ON AUDIOTAPE AND/OR VIDEOTAPE

ESL students can be encouraged to develop fluency by listening to native speakers, such as by listening to specific talk radio programs, television talk shows or newscasts. After obtaining appropriate permission, ESL students can also record and listen to lectures or class discussions, and can, on their own, review videotapes of exemplary student speeches. Additionally, an ESL student can use a tracking technique (Acton, 1984), also called echoing (Morley, 1979), by listening to a native speaker's speech and echoing out loud what is being said. This technique can help develop more native-like patterns of pronunciation, rhythm, stress, and intonation.

OFFERING SPECIFIC FEEDBACK

Instructors can assist by providing specific feedback for the ESL student (as for any student) on areas needing improvement. Assisting the student to emphasize important ideas by pointing out appropriate places to pause, slow down, and lengthen sounds, can help increase comprehensibility significantly. As one example, a listener might be thrown off by a word stress error, as when a speaker says inFINitely (with the stressed syllable pronounced FINE) instead of INfinitely. An error of misplaced stress may be relatively easy for a speaker to correct, when given specific feedback from a listener. Course directors and GTAs can get assistance from language experts on campus in order to identify the nature of an error a student is making so that feedback can be specific and useful.

ENCOURAGING ORAL PRACTICE

Students who have difficulty with some sounds in English may benefit from the oral practice of a particular sound. This is the case with the TH sound because English is one of the few languages in the world in which the TH sound is consistently heard (Dale & Wolf, 1988). These researchers recommend ways instructors can assist students to produce the sound when failing to do so is making the person incomprehensible. Students can be given specific suggestions such as having them look in a mirror while making the sound and practicing the pronunciation of paired terms. By working with paired terms, students can change incorrect TH substitutions such as the "d," "s," and "t" sounds. Thus students can practice replacing incorrect pronunciations, using "think" instead of "sink" and "thigh" instead of "sigh."

ENCOURAGING SELF-MONITORING

ESL students can learn to monitor their speech in specific areas of difficulty. For example, the non-native speaker may omit the third person singular *-S* ending ("He work," "She go," and so forth). When such errors are identified, students can be encouraged to self-monitor. Continued self-monitoring and correcting of this mistake will then encourage "pre-correction."

THINKING RHETORICALLY

Whether or not oral proficiency is a factor in speaking, a student can increase the effectiveness of his or her presentation by recognizing the persuasive demands of speaking — in other words, by thinking rhetorically. Speakers who adopt a rhetorical perspective realize that listeners expect them to: have a strong, clear message to which they are committed; be aware of and recognize who audience members are; and, know how to adapt messages specifically to those audience members in order to be clear and convincing. Students who understand and meet these rhetorical expectations are frequently able to transcend differences in language and cultural background. As the following strategies suggest, GTAs and other instructors can help students meet such expectations through exercises that help them discover their purpose, understand U.S. idiomatic expressions, and understand the background and experiences of their audience members.

Using Guiding Questions

As they approach an assignment and seek a topic about which they can construct a strong message, many students benefit from considering sets of questions or from completing other exercises that help them select the most appropriate

topic for their purpose. Students, can begin this task in class or on their own by using written lists of questions that lead to topic selection. For example, Osborn and Osborn (1997) provide a helpful Self-Awareness Inventory that lists questions appropriate for generating a "speech of self introduction," a three-to-five minute speech designed to introduce the student to the class. Their inventory offers a wide range of questions: "Is your cultural background the most important thing about you?" "Is the most important thing about you the environment in which you grew up?" "Was there some particular person...who had a major impact on your life?" "Have you been marked by some unusual experience?" "Are you best characterized by an activity that brings meaning to your life?" "Is the work you do a major factor in making you who you are?" "Are you best characterized by your goals or purpose in life?" "Are you best described by some value that you hold dear?" (pp. 41-45). Students can use such inventories to stimulate their thinking about topics which are appropriate to the U.S. classroom and which they could use to create a speech with a strong, clear message. Many instructors suggest that it is especially helpful to provide such an inventory — and any other instructions for an assignment — in writing, since many ESL students are more proficient in reading comprehension than listening comprehension.

Dale and Wolf (1988) also suggest written lists of guiding questions or topics that can help ESL students. Questions such as "Where are you from and how long have you been in this country?" "What are you studying here?" and "What are your future plans and goals?" can help the ESL student identify the type of information appropriate for a speech of self introduction. Lists of topics that include "My Opinion of the City," "A Day I'll Always Remember," "My First Job," and so on, can help all students discover ideas for interesting and effective speeches (p. 6). GTAs can list further questions that will help students focus their attention and generate topics appropriate for a public presentation. Students may need to

see such lists in writing and have them discussed in class in order to help them generate their own ideas for the assignment.

Instructors need to encourage students to understand why they are speaking. It is readily apparent to listeners when speakers are unclear about their purpose or do not identify with their topic. ESL students will likely be more effective as speakers if they understand clearly the purpose of the assignment and use the speaking opportunity to discover a topic which gives them a reason to speak. When selecting a topic, all students should be encouraged to remain aware of the listener's needs and to anticipate the listener's question: "Why did you speak on this topic?" (Campbell, 1996).

Assigning Interviews

Instructors of public speaking understand the importance of audience analysis and adaptation; it is especially important that ESL students understand and make use of these concepts. One way instructors can help all students as they prepare to speak, is by having them interview each other (as part of an in-class or out-of-class exercise) about their interest in particular topics. For example, the student preparing to speak about the process of recycling can interview another student (or students) concerning what aspect of the topic would be most interesting to them. A variation of this exercise would entail having each student in a small group rotate the interviewing function. After each interview, group members would suggest possible topics based on the responses provided by each interviewee (Golden, Sprague & Stuart, 1996). Such audience analysis can be achieved as part of small group or general class discussion, where students are able to "try out" their ideas while researching their speech. These kinds of exercises can help the ESL student, in particular, to learn

about the interests or views of other students in what may be an unfamiliar culture.

As they prepare to speak, students can also be encouraged to consider who will hear their message and how those audience members might be motivated to listen. The speaker can use the interview process to discover what the likely sources of listener motivation are; this is especially important for the student who has not shared a great deal in the cultural experiences of the audience members. When speaking, the student can make use of likely motivations by linking the audience directly to the speech and the speaker through the use of narrative, anecdote, relating of a common experience, and relating the speakers' own interest in the topic (Osborn & Osborn, 1997). Students can also be encouraged to think of their audience members in terms of group demographics (characteristics of age, gender, religion, cultural background, education, and so forth); in doing so, they may need to be reminded to view audience members as individuals, too, in order to avoid inappropriate stereotyping or insensitive remarks.

Researching U.S. Experience

It may prove beneficial to ESL students to research specific cultural experiences of U. S. citizens that are related a selected topic. Instructors can assist ESL students to discover some areas of common experience or some widely held or contested values in this culture. Such research will help in the adaptation of the ESL student's message to the classroom audience. When students familiarize themselves with these experiences or values, or can compare sets of values to ones they hold themselves, they have resources to create common ground with listeners. Golden, Sprague and Stuart (1996) introduce the importance of finding common ground with an audience through a classroom exercise they

refer to as "Uncommon Commonalties" (p. 64). Students (with a notecard and pen in hand) can work within a small group of six or can interact with an entire class searching for persons with whom they have something in common. Students may discover commonalties related to the number of hours they work each week, region where they were born, etc. Instructors may also request that students search for uncommon commonalties. This latter variation may be of particular benefit to ESL students in determining where their experiences overlap with those of their audience members.

Using Values Clarification Exercises

All students will benefit from the opportunity to get to know how others think, especially since in public speaking classes this also means getting to know what audience members think about certain topics. Values clarification exercises can help students learn about each others' likes and dislikes and motivations. For example, in an exercise described by Klippel (1995), students are asked to bring three objects (or drawings of objects) to class that are important or significant for them (p. 90). Students work in pairs to explain why the objects are important or why the objects say something significant about them as a person. Students can also complete exercises where they prioritize values or identify aims in life as ways to increase understanding about their own values or the values of others (Klippel, 1995). While such exercises are beneficial generally, they can especially help the ESL student learn more about the values and experiences of U.S. students; likewise, the exercises provide a valuable opportunity for U.S. students to learn about someone from a different culture who may share the same values or think about values very differently.

Viewing Sample Speeches

Sample speeches (written, on audiotape, or on videotape) can help students learn to organize and adapt their presentations. Listeners expect to be able to follow an oral presentation easily; meeting such an expectation is part of being a clear and persuasive speaker. Audiences in the U.S. expect presentations that are organized and include a clearly discernible introduction, body and conclusion. The introduction engages interest and prepares the audience for the speech, the body sets forth the main points of the speech, and the conclusion summarizes the speech and contains a memorable closing that leaves a positive and strong impression (avoiding statements like "That's all I have to say"). Including transition statements in the body (for example, saying "First," or "My next point," and so forth) helps listeners follow the oral message. Transitions prepare the audience for, and create a desire to hear, the next point. In addition to viewing a sample speech, ESL students may benefit by being given a list of alternative words and phrases to use as transitions.

Providing Language Examples

In preparation and presentation, effective speakers keep the listener's understanding in mind. GTAs can encourage students to enhance understanding of ideas by using an appropriate level of language or technical terms for the classroom audience, and by using examples or analogies that help the listener understand the unfamiliar through comparison to the familiar (Osborn & Osborn, 1997). ESL students may benefit from seeing lists of technical and non-technical language that is appropriate for classroom use. Many ESL students may also benefit from seeing lists of idiomatic

expressions. Dale and Wolf (1988) provide such lists, including lists of idioms related to: body parts ("to pull one's leg"); names of food ("as easy as pie"); and names of colors ("green with envy"). ESL students can learn about such idiomatic expressions and test themselves on their knowledge (pp. 99-111). When they have reached an understanding of such expressions and can use them in everyday speech, they may then feel comfortable using such expressions in a formal speaking assignment. Being aware of such expressions also helps ESL students to increase their comprehension of classmates' speaking.

DELIVERY SKILLS

U.S. speakers are expected to be dynamic and to interact with their audience in presentations that are carefully planned, but are not read or memorized. Speakers are often expected to be fairly direct and assertive in their style. The following strategies are among the ways GTAs can assist students in achieving these extemporaneous delivery skills.

Encouraging Oral Practice

Graduate teaching assistants can promote extemporaneous speaking by their ESL students in a number of ways. Effective speakers present their message by speaking in an organized yet conversational manner, while using notes to remind them of the order of their points. ESL students can prepare by practicing orally using the notes as they would in the actual speech (rather than by reading or memorizing a manuscript). The use of short, impromptu speeches in class can help students practice using an informal and interactive style. GTAs can also have students practice short sections of speeches, such as introductions, to help them develop comfort

with direct eye contact and the use of gestures. For some students, the best type of oral practice may, again, be in pairs or small groups where the task of being interactive is not as daunting.

Instructors can also promote interaction and adaptation by speakers through practice sessions. Because speakers receive and respond to feedback from audience members as they speak, ESL students need to keep in mind that the speech may require modification during the actual presentation. On-the-spot adaptation needs to be taught as a characteristic of public speaking and as one of the ways in which a speech is different from an essay. Students can learn this skill by observing audience feedback during their practice speech, by responding to the feedback, and by discussing what they observed and how they responded with audience members afterwards.

Recording on Videotape

Graduate teaching assistants and other instructors can encourage students to establish direct contact with audience members through practice and, when appropriate, through the use of video recording. Audiences expect speakers to communicate to them directly, and to establish eye contact while doing so. Even in large gatherings, speakers attempt to establish eye contact with each part of the audience at some point. Many students (both native and non-native speakers of English) may feel uncomfortable with such directness for a variety of reasons. Encouraging ESL students to use direct eye contact when practicing one-on-one or in small groups may be helpful -- the student can then look for those same familiar and supportive faces in the classroom as he or she begins the actual speech. Again, videotape can help demonstrate to students the positive effect of their eye contact with listeners when it does occur; students can then be encouraged

to increase their eye contact and other forms of direct interaction with the audience.

GTAs can also encourage students to maintain contact with the audience as they anticipate and respond to questions immediately following their presentation. Students can practice listening to and answering questions when giving their speech in pairs or before a small group in class. This gives students the opportunity to listen carefully for the sense of the question as well as practice an effective answer. When students see themselves responding to questions on video, they often see that they are more relaxed and interactive during questions than during the formal speech. Videotape is useful in helping students learn through this comparison.

Encouraging Use of Visual Aids

ESL students can often increase their comprehensibility and enhance their delivery by using visual aids, when appropriate. Especially for the ESL student, visual aids (chalkboard, posterboards, overheads) can increase channels of communication with the audience and help avoid misunderstanding due to language differences. When used correctly, visual aids can make it possible for the student to maintain strong contact with the audience. GTAs need to work carefully with students so that they use visuals in ways that enhance rather than diminish direct contact with the audience.

CONCLUSION

In today's educational setting, instructors and GTAs experience the challenge of adapting their teaching to a diverse classroom. The exact nature of classroom demographics will vary from campus to campus along dimensions

such as race, ethnicity, religion, age, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and nationality. Instructors' ability to address diversity in the form of the ESL student enrolled in the regular ("mixed") public speaking classroom is important to overall teaching effectiveness now and in the future.

Our approach, using one university's basic public speaking course as an example, describes how course directors can be systematic in preparing GTAs in the two central areas of assessment and instructional strategies. The diagnostic and consultation steps reviewed can assist with assessing a student's readiness to enroll in a course and determining the nature of the assistance required. Instructors can use specific instructional strategies to provide students with feedback that enhances students' oral proficiency, rhetorical thinking, and delivery skills.

Using available strategies, course directors, GTAs and other instructors can create opportunities for skill development, make resources available, and provide feedback to ensure the success of all students, including those for whom English is a Second Language.

APPENDIX 1

SUGGESTED STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONS*

1. How long have you lived in the United States?

   _____

2. Where have you lived in the United States?

   _____

3. How long have you attended _____ college (university)?_____

4. Were you advised to enroll in this course?

   Yes ___ No _____

   If yes, who advised you to enroll?

   If yes, what was the reason you were advised to enroll?

5. What other courses will require that you give oral presentations this term?

   _____

6. What U.S. courses have you been enrolled in that have required oral presentations in the past?

   _____

7. How often do you speak English outside of class?

   _____

8. Who do you speak with Native English speakers?

   _____

* This survey is based, in part, on J. Reid's (in press) "Which nonnative speaker? Differences between international students and U.S. resident (language minority) students."

Non-Native English speakers?

_____

9. Have you asked for assistance from any ESL or International Student Organization on this campus?
   Yes _____ No _____

   On previous campuses? Yes _____ No_____

10. How much of the lecture do you understand when I speak? All_____ Almost All_____ Half_____ Less Than Half_____ Very Little_____ None_____

11. How much of the class discussion do you understand?

    All_____ Almost All_____ Half_____

    Less Than Half_____ Very Little_____ None_____

12. Have you been in situations where native English speakers had difficulty understanding your speaking?

    Yes _____ No _____

    If yes, what were the situations?

    _____

REFERENCES

Acton, W. (1984). Changing fossilized pronunciation. *TESOL Quarterly, 18,* 71-86.

Beebe, S. A. & Beebe, S. J. (1994). *Public speaking: A audience-centered approach* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Braithwaite, C. A. & Braithwaite, D. O. (1991). Instructional communication strategies for adapting to a multicultural introductory course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 3,* 145-160.

Campbell, J. A. (1996). Oratory, democracy, and the classroom. In R. Soder (Ed.), *Democracy, education, and the schools* (pp. 211-243). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cronin, M. W. (1986). *The nature and treatment of speech fright.* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Professional Communication Conference, Charlotte, NC.

Dale, P. & Wolf, J. C. (1988). *Speech communication for international students.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, self-perceived competency, and teacher immediacy in the laboratory-supported public speaking course: Trends and relationships. *Communication Education, 44,* 64-78.

Ferris, D. & Tagg, T. (1996). Academic oral communication needs of EAP learners: What subject-matter instructors actually require. *TESOL Quarterly, 30,* 31-58.

Golden, M. A., Sprague, J. & Stuart, D. (1996). *Instructor's manual to accompany the speaker's handbook* (4th. ed.) Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Hendrix, K. G., Allensworth, N. & Marton, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Oral communication student workbook.* (Available from

the University Bookstore, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152).

Hill, B. L. & Javidi, M. (1993). The needs of the international student. In L. W. Hugenberg, P. L. Gray & D. M. Trank (Eds.). *Teaching and directing the basic communication course* (pp. 263-269). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Klippel, F. (1995). *Keep talking: Communicative fluency activities for language teaching.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lucas, S. E. (1995). *The art of public speaking* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marques, K. W. (1997). *ESL teaching guide.* [Supplement]. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory. *Human Communication Research, 4,* 78-96.

McCroskey, J. C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication* (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McKinney, B. C. & Pullum, S. J. (1994). Obstacles to overcome in the implementation of a program to reduce communication apprehension in the basic public speaking course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 6,* 70-86.

Meloni, C. F. & Thompson, S. E. (1980). Oral reports in the intermediate ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 14,* 503-510.

Morley, J. (1979). *Improving spoken English.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Murphy, J. M. (1992). Preparing ESL students for the basic speech course: Approach, design and procedure. *English for Specific Purposes, 11,* 51-70.

Murphy, J. M. (1993). An ESL oral communication class: One teacher's techniques and principles. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 5,* 157-181.

Nelson, P. E. & Pearson, J. C. (1996). *Confidence in public speaking* (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown

Osborn, M. & Osborn, S. (1997). *Public speaking* (4th ed.) Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Porter, P. A. & Grant, M. (1992). *Communicating effectively in English* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Quigley, B. L. & Nyquist, J. D. (1992). Using video technology to provide feedback to students in performance classes. *Communication Education, 41,* 324-334.

Quigley, B. L., Hendrix, K. G., Aoki, E. & Matthews, D. G. (in press). Preparing teaching assistants to incorporate a public perspective: One approach to addressing diversity issues in instruction. *Proceedings of the 5th National Conference on the Training and Employment of Graduate Teaching Assistants.*

Reid, J. (in press). Which nonnative speaker? Differences between international students and U.S. resident (language minority) students. In D. Sigsbee, B. Speck, and B. Maylath (Eds.). *Approaches to teaching non-native English speakers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shankar, A. D. (1993). Issues of ethnic diversity in the basic course. In L. W. Hugenberg, P. L. Gray & D. M. Trank (Eds.), *Teaching and directing the basic communication course* (pp. 291-298). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Sprague, J. & Stuart, D. (1996). *The speaker's handbook* (4th ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace, and Jovanovich.

Webster, L. J. (1993). The needs of the non-traditional student. In L. W. Hugenberg, P. L. Gray & D. M. Trank (Eds.), *Teaching and directing the basic communication course* (pp. 257-261). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Yook, E. & Seiler, W. J. (1990). An investigation into the communication needs and concerns of Asian students in speech communication performance classes. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2,* 47-75.

Zimmerman, S. (1995). Perceptions of intercultural communication competence and international student adaptation to an American campus. *Communication Education, 44,* 321-335.

Applying Multiple Intelligences Theory to the Basic Public Speaking Course

Kristi A. Schaller
Marybeth G. Callison

Students learn differently. Research on student learning indicates that intelligence is multidimensional and can include many abilities that are not always manifested in traditional classroom assignments and activities (Gardner, 1993; Gardner, Kornhaber & Wake, 1996; Nelson, 1995; Pinto, Geiger & Boyle, 1994; Reiff, 1992). Traditionally, students have been taught in ways that emphasize left-brain strengths such as verbal and analytical skills and logic while right-brain strengths such as creativity and intuition have been virtually ignored (O'Brien, 1989).

Recent works in psychology have questioned traditional views of intelligence. Gardner's Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory (Gardner, 1983; 1993) and Goleman's (1995) work on emotional intelligence suggest that intelligence should be viewed not as a single independent entity, but as a plurality of aptitudes that develop in differing degrees, depending on the individual. Gardner's MI theory discourages educational practices such as standardized, linear presentations of material in favor of methods that recognize differences among individuals (Armstrong, 1994).

Research in cognitive psychology indicates that students are motivated to learn when they are involved in the learning process and when instructional approaches allow them to be reflexive about their learning (Armstrong, 1994; Reiff, 1992). The framework of MI theory encourages teachers to involve

and motivate students. Armstrong (1994) explains that, "MI theory essentially encompasses what good teachers have always done in their teaching: reaching beyond the text and the blackboard to awaken students' minds" (pp. 49-50). Therefore, we argue that teachers must employ teaching methods that appeal to multiple student aptitudes to maximize student learning.

This research applies Gardner's MI theory to instruction for the basic public speaking course. We will describe each of the seven intelligences, and provide specific strategies for applying assignments and activities that relate to each of the intelligences.

The basic public speaking course is an excellent forum for using a diversity of instructional methods to correspond with different student intelligences. Students in public speaking courses learn both oral and written communication skills through a variety of assignments and activities. Gibson, Hanna & Leichty (1990) report that public speaking is the preferred instructional format for a basic course (favored over a hybrid course or an interpersonal communication course) at U.S. colleges and universities. Public speaking is typically required of students from numerous fields of study, and enrollments are increasing (Gibson, Hanna & Leichty, 1990; Handford, 1993). With such a large diverse population of students enrolled, the basic public speaking course is ideal for examining students' multiple intelligences and preferences for teaching techniques.

While MI theory is currently used as an instructional foundation in K-12 schools throughout the country (Project Spectrum at the Elliot Pearson Children's School at Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts; the Key School in Indianapolis; and the Arts Propel in the Pittsburgh Public Schools), little effort has been made to apply MI theory to college and university classrooms (Armstrong, 1994). We argue that, if a goal of MI theory is to "assist students in developing higher levels of understanding through their

multiple intelligences" (Armstrong, p. 153), then the theory is equally pertinent to college students.

MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY

Gardner (1983) defines intelligence as "a biopsychological potential that is drawn on within a culture for a variety of purposes" (p. 577). Specifically, Gardner (1993) states:

> An intelligence entails the ability to solve problems or fashion products that are of consequence in a particular cultural setting or community. The problem-solving skill allows one to approach a situation in which a goal is to be obtained and to locate the appropriate route to that goal. The creation of a *cultural* product is crucial to such functions as capturing and transmitting knowledge or expressing one's views or feelings. The problems to be solved range from creating an end for a story to anticipating a mating move in chess to repairing a quilt. Products range from scientific theories to musical compositions to successful political campaigns (p. 15).

An intelligence is an ability, a talent, or a mental skill that encompasses what Gardner (1993) terms "human cognitive competence" (p. 15).

Gardner (1983) proposed that individuals possess seven intelligences: 1) bodily-kinesthetic; 2) verbal-linguistic; 3) logical-mathematical; 4) musical-rhythmic; 5) visual-spatial; 6) interpersonal-social; and 7) intrapersonal-introspective. The degree of development for a particular intelligence differs for each individual. Armstrong (1993) explains that "each person possesses all seven intelligences and has the ability to develop each one to a reasonable level of proficiency" (p. 221). Gardner places equal *value* on each of the seven intelligences; his theory does not give priority to the logical or linguistic intelligences, which have traditionally been viewed as the measure of intelligence.

The seven intelligences have been conceptualized as follows (Armstrong, 1993; 1994; Gardner, 1993):

The *bodily-kinesthetic* intelligence deals with the body and the physical self; the body is used to express ideas and emotions, to build products, and to play games and sports. Dancers, actors, athletes, surgeons, mechanics, and craftspeople have highly developed bodily-kinesthetic intelligence.

The *verbal-linguistic* intelligence deals with reading, writing, and linguistic skills. Individuals who have developed this intelligence enjoy puns, reading, word games, and are skilled at verbal and/or written expression. Verbal-linguistic intelligence is manifested by orators, poets, playwrights, editors, politicians, journalists, lawyers, and storytellers.

The *logical-mathematical* intelligence includes logical, mathematical, and scientific abilities such as reasoning, conceptualizing hypotheses or cause-effect relationships, and the recognition of abstract relationships or patterns. Scientists, accountants, mathematicians, and computer programmers have highly developed logical-mathematical intelligence.

Individuals who possess high degrees of *musical-rhythmic* intelligence appreciate or respond to rhythms and melodies or may also write and/or perform music. Examples of individuals with a high level of this intelligence include composers, performers, and music critics.

The *visual-spatial* intelligence involves the ability to create mental pictures or visual representations or models. These individuals are sensitive to visual details and learn best through mentally visualizing or actually seeing things. Visual-spatial individuals include engineers, surgeons, artists, sculptors, photographers, interior designers, architects, and pilots.

The *interpersonal-social* intelligence deals with the ability to understand and relate to others; and to work effectively with and to be responsive to other people. This intelligence also involves an awareness of others' moods, motivations, intentions, and nonverbal communication. Teachers, sales-

people, politicians, negotiators, and religious leaders possess high degrees of interpersonal-social intelligence.

Finally, the *intrapersonal-introspective* intelligence involves a keen awareness of one's inner self: feelings, emotional states, self-esteem, and goals. Those who have a highly developed intrapersonal-introspective intelligence tend to be contemplative and to have accurate images of themselves. Counselors and theologians would possess a high degree of intrapersonal-introspective intelligence.

It should be noted that the seven intelligences are interactive; they do not act in isolation from one another. At any given time, individuals typically use more than one intelligence to accomplish a task, solve a problem, play a board game or a sport, and engage in other activities.

MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY IN THE BASIC COURSE

Gardner (1995) indicates three positive ways in which MI theory can be used in schools: first, to teach students the skills and abilities that are valued by the community and by the broader society; second, to use a pluralistic or interdisciplinary approach to curriculum development that deviates from the traditional lecture format; and third, to personalize education to acknowledge and address individual student differences. The basic public speaking course easily meets these three criteria: skills acquired in the basic public speaking course will be used in college and beyond. Students who improve their ability to communicate increase their chances of success as adults both personally and professionally (Ford & Wolvin, 1993; Gibson, Hanna & Huddleston, 1985; Vangelisti & Daly, 1989). A public speaking course can be structured to teach the material in a variety of ways; and, finally, public speaking credits students as individual thinking, feeling beings.

According to Gardner's theory (1993), students can either experience *crystallizing experiences* (the "aha!" positive feeling of a success) or *paralyzing experiences* (the sense of failure). These experiences typically happen at a young age, but can occur at any age in a person's life (Armstrong, 1993, 1994; Gardner, 1993). The basic public speaking course is particularly relevant for this concept. Instead of looking forward to the public speaking course, students usually are apprehensive; to perform poorly would negatively impact student self-esteem. We, as educators have the ability to redirect potentially paralyzing experiences into crystallizing experiences.

As students review a public speaking course syllabus, they generally will find a lecture (theory) and speaking (practical application) format (Gibson, Hanna, & Huddleston, 1985; Wright, 1993). Course activities may include research, homework, and in-class speeches. The in-class speeches may be impromptu, extemporaneous, memorized or manuscript; in-class activities may be graded or may be ungraded. While the emphasis of the teaching method may vary according to the instructor's personal preferences, the expectations for students who complete the course are the same: *competence in the written portion of public speaking* (test-taking skills; research presentation; and speech outlines); *competence in the preparation and delivery of a speech* (effective topic selection and audience analysis; effective vocal and nonverbal delivery), and *competence in the theories of communication and public speaking* (ability to understand how these interrelate and how to use them to produce effective speeches).

CLASSROOM EXERCISES AND MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES

Public speaking curricula can be tailored to students' seven intelligences. For example, communication theory (such as language development and rhetorical theory) would appeal

to verbal-linguistic and logical-mathematical thinkers who understand the concepts and see the overview of communication. Interpersonal thinkers can also appreciate the interconnections of communication and public speaking, and should be encouraged to view public speaking as a teaching format or as a connection with other people, since they typically interact comfortably with others. Visual-spatial thinkers can see the purpose and results of communication through visual reinforcement (such as videotapes of exemplary public speeches) and through the actual event of public speaking as it happens in the classroom setting. Bodily-kinesthetic learners can appreciate the importance of the nonverbal facets of public speaking; they should be encouraged to be expressive with their hands and to walk while speaking to stimulate their thinking ability. Musical intelligences should focus on pitch and inflection and other uses of the voice to convey messages - they should be taught that public speaking is not in the words alone. Intrapersonal intelligences should be encouraged to think of public speaking as a "goal" that will have personal benefits.

Following are some classroom assignments and activities that may be added to a public speaking instructor's repertoire of teaching methods in order to relate to students' multiple intelligences. Activities are categorized according to each intelligence.

Linguistic Intelligence

1. Revise and rewrite a poor speech
2. Rewrite the text of a book or newspaper/magazine article into manuscript form
3. Encourage storytelling exercises (chain stories; true or fictional stories, etc.)

4. Develop a hypothetical speaking club or association and explain the rules (this exercise also accesses the logical-mathematical intelligence)

SPATIAL INTELLIGENCE

1. Describe a design to the class (or to one classmate) and have the listener(s) try to replicate the design
2. Have students en masse observe a non-typical location (without explaining the purpose of the observation); then have students return to the classroom and give impromptu speeches describing the location
3. Have students observe a videotape of a crime, or an enactment of a crime, and then describe the victim and the criminal
4. Have students visit an art display (local museum, university, etc.) and then describe one of the pieces of art that they liked
5. Encourage students to use visual aids (flat and dimensional) with their speeches
6. Provide students with random objects; have them create and describe a new use for the objects
7. Have students describe new products or processes that would be useful at school

MUSICAL INTELLIGENCE

1. Incorporate music (such as jingles or advertisements) into impromptu persuasive speeches using Monroe's Motivated Sequence
2. Have students discuss what music they would add to a speech to give it emphasis without overriding the message

3. Use music as an "aural aid" (instead of using a visual aid)
4. Have students give speeches about the importance of music in our everyday lives
5. Have students debate whether music aids or interferes with studying (musical versus non-musical intelligences)
6. Have students bring favorite lyrics to class and describe their meaning (linguistic and musical intelligences)
7. Have students give speeches about "my most important musical experience"

BODILY-KINESTHETIC

1. Have students give speeches about exercise, athletics, sports, or acting
2. Encourage students to walk and move around within the parameters of their speaking area (movement stimulates the brain of bodily-kinesthetic types and facilitates thinking and talking)
3. Encourage students to discuss their "gut reactions" to other speeches (responding to a speaker's nonverbal delivery as well as to the topic and content of a speech)
4. Make students aware of their body posture by describing a hypothetical "confidence suit." For example, tell students they do not have to "dress professionally" to deliver a speech in front of the class; however, have them describe hypothetical clothes (such as imaginary padded shoulders, an invisible back brace to facilitate posture, and no pockets to occupy their fidgeting hands) that would benefit their posture and maximize their delivery

5. Have students practice visualization techniques for relaxation
6. Have students play "Charades" for speech-related topics

LOGICAL-MATHEMATICAL

1. Assign abstract thought exercises dealing with "what if" scenarios
2. Have students prepare and present arguments and corresponding counter-arguments in impromptu speeches
3. Assign "guestimating" exercises to answer hypothetical questions; have students explain how they arrived at their answers. (For example: "A study recently revealed that the fifth grade is a pivotal time to determine whether or not students will become effective public speakers. What do you think happens in the fifth grade that would make this be so?")

INTERPERSONAL

1. Show pictures of people and have students describe what they are doing or thinking
2. Assign exercises dealing with the similarities between public speaking and everyday conversation
3. Have students observe people at school and describe their interactions
4. Have students speak to classmates and try to influence, encourage, or discourage them
5. Have students present impromptu speeches on why quality circles are important in the workplace or why interactive classrooms are appropriate

INTRAPERSONAL

1. Have students reveal a self-disclosure to the class
2. Have students discuss how they are "different" from everyone else, and what they have to offer due to that difference
3. Have students discuss their goals for the public speaking class
4. Have students keep a journal about their public speaking experience(s) in-class and away from class
5. Have students present impromptu speeches about their dreams and interpretations of the dreams
6. Have students present impromptu speeches in which they assume the identities of other people and then explain why they would like to meet themselves

In addition to in-class exercises and homework assignments that incorporate the multiple intelligences, students should also be encouraged to select topics that reflect their personal intelligences. Educators can broaden the range of speech topics to adapt to the spectrum of intelligences instead of narrowing the speech topics to fit only a few. For example, verbal-linguistic types might speak about storytelling classes or conventions or about word games and board games such as "Trivial Pursuit." Spatial intelligences may like three-dimensional or visual games; still or video photography; drawing, sculpting or painting; and should be encouraged to use visual support of their topics. Musical types may talk about the dynamics of music and should be encouraged to incorporate music into their speeches. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligences may talk about body movement and its importance, and demonstrate bodily movement as their visual aids (showing the steps to country line dancing or tai chi or yoga). Speeches about acting, mime, sports, and other "hands-on" activities would also be appropriate for those with bodily-

kinesthetic intelligence. Logical-mathematical types may speak about computer languages, problem solving, science-related venues or activities or products. Interpersonal intelligences may discuss networking, volunteerism, collaboration, etiquette, the importance of other cultures, and the lives of socially competent individuals (philanthropists, counselors, politicians, social workers, etc.). Intrapersonal students may speak about meditation or introspective exercises, counseling, dreams, entrepreneurship, hobbies, self-esteem, assertiveness, or self-confidence.

The best solution to reach the broadest audience of students would be to provide a variety of topics or exercises for each assignment, and then allow students to choose. These choices will allow students to maximize their particular intelligences while deriving the greatest benefit from their public speaking experience.

CONCLUSION

Gardner's (1983; 1993) MI theory provides an excellent framework for public speaking instructors to address differing student intelligences. Gardner admits that MI theory is not a panacea for educational reform. However, the theory represents a form of curriculum development aimed at meeting individual student learning needs. The purpose of this paper has been to introduce communication educators to MI theory, and to delineate ways to apply it in the basic public speaking course. Our goal was not to provide additional empirical support for MI theory, but to suggest that the theory and its educational implications should be given serious consideration. Public speaking instructors are in an excellent position to reach a large population of students and to facilitate student learning and motivation by attending to differing intelligences. Future research could be conducted to determine what methods are being used to teach public speaking,

and which intelligences are represented by these methods. Also, empirical research could examine the potential relationships among student multiple intelligences, learning, and motivation.

Teachers cannot individualize their instruction, but the MI framework encourages teachers to use a variety of teaching methods to adapt to diverse student aptitudes. Armstrong (1994) states that MI theory "can help educators learn their own style, plus introduces broad activities to develop neglected intelligences, activate underdeveloped or paralyzed intelligences, and bring developed intelligences to higher levels of proficiency" (p. 23). For each platform of learning, we must expand our repertoire of teaching styles to include most, if not all, of the multiple intelligences.

We encourage those who teach the basic public speaking course to consider supplementing current teaching methods with the activities suggested here. These activities will relate to student multiple intelligences and personalize the educational process, thereby making learning more meaningful and relevant to a greater number of students. Given that students possess different intelligences in varying degrees and, therefore, learn differently, the traditional teaching methods do not seem sufficient to reach all students.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, T. (1993). *Seven kinds of smart: Identifying and developing your many intelligences.* New York: Penguin Books.

Armstrong, T. (1994). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ford, W. S. Z. & Wolvin, A. D. (1993). The differential impact of a basic communication course on perceived communica-

tion competencies in class, work, and social contexts. *Communication Education, 42,* 215-223.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligence.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1994). Intelligences in theory and practice: A response to Elliot W. Eisner, Robert J. Sternberg, and Henry M. Levin. *Teachers College Record, 95,* 576-583.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Reflections on multiple intelligences: Myths and messages.* Phi Delta Kappan, 77, 200-209.

Gardner, H., Kornhaber, M. L. & Wake, W. K. (1996). *Intelligence: Multiple perspectives.* Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S. & Huddleston, B. M. (1985). The basic speech course at U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education, 34,* 281-291.

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S. & Leichty, G. (1990). The basic speech course at colleges and universities: V. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2,* 233-257.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Handford, C. J. (1993). Service course or introduction to the discipline. In L. W. Hugenberg, P. L. Gray & D. M. Trank (Eds.), *Teaching and directing the basic communication course* (pp. 27-32). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Nelson, K. (1995). Nurturing kids' seven ways of being smart: How to develop your students' multiple intelligences. *Instructor,* 26-34.

O'Brien, L. (1989). Learning styles: Make the student aware. *NASSP Bulletin, 73,* 85-89.

Pinto, J. K., Geiger, M. A. & Boyle, E. J. (1994). A three-year longitudinal study of changes in student learning styles. *Journal of College Student Development, 35,* 113-119.

Reiff, J. C. (1992). *Learning styles. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.*

Vangelisti, A. L. & Daly, J. A. (1989). Correlates of speaking skills in the United States: A national assessment. *Communication Education, 38,* 132-143.

Wright, D. W. (1993). Theory versus performance. In L. W. Hugenberg, P. L. Gray & D. M. Trank (Eds.), *Teaching and directing the basic communication course* (pp. 27-32). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Delineating the Uses of Practical Theory: A Reply to Hickson

Shawn Spano

Let me begin by thanking Professor Hickson for his comments on the article I published in the 1996 issue of the *Basic Communication Course Annual* (Hickson, 1996; Spano, 1996). I consider it a compliment that my ideas about practical theory interested him enough to write a rejoinder. More importantly, Hickson's response provides us with an opportunity to "continue the conversation" on the role of theory in the basic course.

It might be useful here to provide some background on how this conversation started. In 1995 I presented a paper on practical theory on a SCA program sponsored by the Basic Course Commission. Soon after, I submitted a revised version of the SCA paper for publication in the *Annual*. The final version of the essay, the one that appeared in the last issue of the *Annual,* thus evolved through a series of conversations between myself and a program respondent, a journal editor, three members of the editorial board, and a few other colleagues who took the time to read the article and talk to me about it.

The conversation might have stopped there if Professor Hickson had not elected to join it by writing a response. The current editor of the *Annual,* Larry Hugenberg, has now agreed to let us take yet another "turn" in this conversation. My hope is that this ongoing exchange will evoke the kind of responses that invigorate our teaching and ultimately assist us in helping our students improve their communication

117

abilities. Specifically, I would like to use this response — my turn in the conversation — to accomplish three objectives. First, to clarify what practical theory is and resolve some misunderstandings about it. Second, to describe how I arrived at a practical theory approach to communication education. Third, to show through a series of examples how practical theory can enrich the basic course.

CLARIFYING ASSUMPTIONS: THE TRADITIONAL PARADIGM

In the original article I critically questioned the usefulness of positivist-based theory and research in the basic course. To put a face on the kind of theory I am talking about, I would nominate uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) as a prototypical example. Uncertainty reduction theory assumes the familiar form of most traditional social scientific theory. It consists of a set of statements or propositions that are logically connected to one another and empirically testable using some method of quantitative research. The thrust of my original criticism is that this theory, *in its propositional form,* is not particularly useful in helping students or teachers improve their communication abilities. As I hope to show later, positivist-based theory can be used to improve communication performance in those circumstances where the propositional form of the theory is changed.

A few points concerning the traditional paradigm need clarification. First, I do not take the position, as Hickson (1996) states, "that empirical research and theory are to be separated from practice" (p. 101). My argument is just the opposite: research and theory need to be much more responsive to communication practice. Second, I am not advocating that we eliminate theory altogether from the basic course. My position is that we rethink our ideas of theory, or more accu-

rately the way we practice theory in the basic course. Practical theory is sufficiently responsive to communication practice because, as paradoxical as this might sound, *theory itself is treated as a communication practice.*

The third point concerns the theory-practice dichotomy. It is my position that, in the end, this dichotomy is an inevitable feature of the positivist and postpositivist research approach. Hickson (1996) addresses this issue in slightly different way. He argues that historically the division was between research and theory, not theory and practice. Early "variable-testing" research is given as an example of research which operated independently of theory. Whether this or any research can ever be completely free of theoretical influence is a matter of serious contention. Fortunately, it is not an issue that we need to debate here, because as Hickson (1996) reminds us, the vast majority of positivist-based research today is explicitly theoretical ("theoretical" in the sense of the propositional form described above and in the original essay).

The evolution from non-theoretical to theoretical-based research, as Hickson (1996) describes it, seems to me to be indicative of the move from positivism to postpositivism (see Guba, 1990). This interpretation leads me to conclude that my original criticism focused more on postpositivism research and theory than its predecessor. I do not think this changes the essential point of my argument, however, concerning the inherent dualism between theory and practice in the traditional paradigm. There are many ways to bring communication practice into the fold of research and theory. Obviously, I favor practical theory. I am also intrigued by Hickson's suggestion that we treat communication practice, teaching, observation, research, and theory as part of an interconnected *web* (Stacks, Hickson & Hill, 1991). We might even use the next turn in our conversation to explore the connections between these two approaches.

HOW I ARRIVED AT PRACTICAL THEORY

The postpositivist paradigm of communication research has shaped my professional life in some important ways. Most of my graduate education was spent learning social psychological theories of human behavior and quantitative social science research methods. While doing course work I also taught lower division performance courses in public speaking and interpersonal communication. Reconciling these two activities — research oriented course work and teaching — was not always an easy task. Indeed, the disparity between the two was established at the beginning of my graduate education. I vividly remember the department chair telling us new M.A. students during orientation that the demands of our course work would naturally conflict with our teaching duties. Our first obligation, he said, was to our course work.

It was clear the department chair believed research and teaching to be separate activities and that teaching is the less important of the two. For the next ten or so years I simply assumed that this was the accepted model among university faculty and administrators. It was actually quite easy to do since very little in my professional experience contradicted it. That does not mean I personally adhered to the model. In fact, for a variety of reasons I chose to define myself as a teacher first and a researcher second, realizing all along that in accordance with the model I would be relegated to second class status behind the research elite.

Soon after taking a faculty position I started working more closely with interpretive, qualitative approaches to communication research, especially in the area of social constructionism. While I continued to teach the beginning public speaking course, I also started assuming professional service responsibilities in curriculum development and student outcomes assessment. At the same time, my office mate, who studied in the area of communication education, and I would

regularly have conversations about some scholarly aspect of teaching. This usually involved one of us sharing a particular teaching experience and then using the experience to launch off into some discussion related to communication theory and research. It was a new way of talking about teaching and I enjoyed it immensely.

Eventually I realized that my research interests intersected with my new found role of "teacher-scholar." The epiphany was not simply that research and teaching were related, it was that the two could enrich one another in some exciting and useful ways. In this regard, Cronen's (1995a, 1995b, 1996) treatment of practical theory and recent writings in the coordinated management of meaning theory have been instrumental in providing me with a concrete framework for integrating social constructionist theory and research with my teaching activities. In fact, it was Cronen's (1995b) work which prompted me to write the original SCA paper in the first place.

Practical Theory Example 1

It seems to me that there are a number of advantages for using practical theory in communication education. As I stated in the original article, "teachers in the basic course not only employ practical theory, but they are also engaged practical theorists themselves" (Spano, 1996, p. 85). I would like to use the following example to illustrate, initially at least, how teachers can begin to work with practical theory and as practical theorists. It is important to keep in mind that what the teacher as practical theorist brings to the classroom is a set of pedagogical communicative practices that are interventionist in nature because their purpose is to improve (i.e. alter, modify, transform) students' communication abilities.

- Pamela is preparing materials for the first day of her oral communication class. She calculates that she has

taught close to 30 sections of the oral communication course since she began teaching 10 years ago. During that time she has developed dozens of exercises, handouts, and speech assignments. While Pamela has commented on more than one occasion that she could "teach this course in her sleep," she knows full well the importance of being fully present and fully engaged in all aspects of her teaching.

- As a communication teacher and practical theorist, Pamela knows that how she presents material to the students is as important as the material itself. As she sees it, her job is not simply to transmit information from teacher to student, but to enter into an interaction with students so they are able to situate themselves in the material. Put differently, she wants to adapt the material to the unique needs, interests, passions, and experiences of the students. Her objective on this first day of class is to create a context for students to take ownership of the course and their own communication abilities. She begins by asking students what their expectations are, what their previous experiences were, what they fear, and what they are looking forward to. She leads the class in an exercise where students first take an inventory of themselves as public speakers and then visualize themselves as public speakers at the end of the term.
- The general idea behind these communication practices is to elicit the "grammar" of the students: how they talk about the course, how they see themselves relative to the course and in relationship to other students and the instructor, and how the course fits within their larger cultural frames of reference. Understanding the grammar of the students is the starting point for a practical theory of communication education. So Pamela listens carefully to the language of her stu-

> dents, to their grammar. She figures that being able to engage in meaningful interaction with her students puts her in a position to help them improve their own ways of talking.

Through Pamela we can begin to see the kind of attitude or orientation the practical theorist brings to teaching. First, there is an explicit recognition that teaching and learning are performative acts and that communication teachers are in a very real sense communication practitioners. Pamela knows that her course materials do not speak for themselves; they must be enacted, practiced, and performed. Second, there is a quality dimension to the teaching and learning process which is dependent on the ways that teachers and students interact together. This is why Pamela is so sensitive to the dynamics of classroom communication and the speaking and listening process. Third, teachers have criteria for assessing the success of their teaching practices. The goals and outcomes Pamela has for her students will be realized when students are able to demonstrate particular communication abilities.

CLARIFYING ASSUMPTIONS: PRACTICAL THEORY

Hickson (1996) noted some confusion in my treatment of practical theory in the basic course. Much of this confusion appears to revolve around the question of whether communication is best learned by applying previously tested theoretical propositions or by responding to the unique contingencies embedded in each moment of social interaction. Hickson (1996) strongly objects to practical theory on the grounds that it presumes students and teachers must "start from scratch" each time they attempt to learn new communication abilities. I agree that practical theory would indeed be deficient if that was all it had to offer. Instead of "starting from scratch,"

however, practical theorists work instead with something more closely resembling "trial and error."

Let me try to clarify this distinction more carefully by, first, describing trial and error in terms of the American pragmatist tradition and, second, illustrating the importance of social interaction in the teaching and learning process.

In the original article I traced the lineage of practical theory to Aristotle's notion of praxis, and alluded to the sophistic tradition as another source of insight. The tradition of American Pragmatism, particularly as it was espoused by John Dewey and William James, provides a more recent influence. James (1978) described pragmatism as "the attitude of looking away from first things, principles, 'categories,' supposed necessities; and of looking toward things, fruits, consequences, and facts" (cited in Barber, 1984, p. 177). It is this sense of the meaning of "practical" that informs practical theory.

Given the commitment to American pragmatism, it follows that practical theory would adopt something resembling trial and error method. This method does not mean, as Hickson (1996) states, that we have to "start from scratch" every time we encounter a new communication situation (p. 101). It simply means that *we observe the consequences of our actions and use these in a reflexive-dialectical fashion to guide subsequent actions.* When working within the domain of praxis, it makes sense to say that "[e]very interaction is a unique moment at the same time that each is informed by the historicity of prior interaction events and informs future events" (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996, p. 14). The communication practices a teacher brings to an educational context may be ones that have been used many times before. But unless those practices have been "successful" as gauged by the consequences of their use, I cannot imagine why the teacher would choose to use them again.

At the same time, there is no guarantee that past practices will be successful in the present situation or in future

situations. A practice must always be performed "in the moment." I do not want to overstate the uniqueness of every interaction event — the present is always shaped within an historical context. Conversely, I do not want to overstate the permanency which can be attributed to a conventionalized practice. After all, that practice has to be put into action over and over again for it to become conventional. What practical theory tries to do is work with the dialectical tension that exists between stability and change, between what is predictable and what is open ended.

In addition to the influence of early American pragmatism, recent writings in pragmatism also help frame the conceptual boundaries of practical theory. What most contemporary pragmatists share is a common focus on communication, discourse, conversation, and the constitutive properties of language (Bernstein, 1983; Rorty, 1982). This focus is clearly at the heart of Cronen's (1995a) recent work in social constructionism and the coordinated management of meaning theory. According to Cronen (1995a), social reality, and to that I would add the social reality created by teachers and students, "is constituted in and through processes of communication" (p. 19). Given the intellectual lineage of practical theory it should be apparent that it is not grounded in phenomenology, as Hickson (1996) states.

A practical theory of communication education focuses on social interaction as the primary site of teaching and learning. Simply stated, *teaching and learning are thought to be constructed in patterns of pedagogical communication practice.* Furthermore, *these patterns of communication are jointly coordinated and negotiated by teachers and students.* I would like to emphasize this point perhaps more than any other in clarifying what practical theory is, how it works, and how it differs from postpositivist theory. Foregrounding communication, language, discourse, and conversation as the primary site of teaching and learning has some profound implications

for how practical and postpositivist theory are integrated into the basic course.

Practical Theory Example 2

The following example is designed to show how the propositional form of traditional theory must be transformed if it is to have educational value as a resource in communication education. It is my position that practical theory provides a way to accomplish this theoretical transformation. This is important because it illustrates how postpositivist theory can be used as a pedagogical resource in the basic course.

- Alicia, a new graduate teaching assistant, is teaching her first oral communication course. Like most teaching assistants, Alicia is bright, eager, and committed. In fact she has conducted some library research in preparation for the upcoming section of the course on source credibility. Alicia has a pretty good idea of what source credibility is, but she figures that she will do a better job teaching the topic if she becomes more familiar with social science research in this area.
- Reading through the numerous credibility studies is actually quite interesting to Alicia, but the more she reads the more frustrated she gets. The problem is that the research findings are presented as general statements that offer little insight into how she and her students can actually use credibility in the classroom. To be fair, Alicia recognizes that the research was not designed for pedagogical purposes. Nevertheless, she is not sure what to do with what she is reading. For example, one study found that speakers will be perceived as more credible by an audience if the audience perceives the speaker to be trustworthy. Alicia thinks,

"what am I supposed to do, go into class and simply state this research claim to my students?"

- Alicia is not satisfied with the credibility research in its present form. She guesses that she might be missing something. Eventually it occurs to her that the goal of the research is to produce logically sound, empirically testable statements about credibility that are as widely applicable as possible. Nothing more, nothing less. It further occurs to her that these statements in and of themselves are not going to be particularly useful to her or her students, although she does sense that they might be helpful as a starting point. She is convinced that some serious work still needs to be done. So Alicia begins to think about ways she can tailor the research findings to the unique demands of her class, her speech assignments, and her students.
- What Alicia ends up developing is a series of concrete examples and exercises on credibility. In one of the exercises, students discuss how other well-known speakers have established their credibility (or not) and how students can go about establishing credibility in their own classroom speeches. Afterwards, Alicia makes what she thinks is a rather curious observation: how she and her students ended up talking about credibility did not sound at all like the research claims she read. In fact, students generated some comments about credibility which Alicia thought were valid even though they contradicted some of the research findings.

The form of practical theory that I am advancing here integrates postpositivist theory into the fold, but does so by changing the grounds on which the theory is based. First, traditional theories are treated as communication practices, as kinds of "language games" to use a Wittgensteinian term. As such, the teaching and learning of these theories tran-

spires through the coordinated and negotiated actions of teachers and students. Once teachers start to work with formal theory in this way they are *doing practical theory.* Second, how the theory is actually taught and learned depends on the myriad of contingencies embedded in any given educational situation. Indeed, a major part of Alicia's task was to adapt extant credibility theory and research to her students and to her course assignments. In a very real sense, Alicia had to treat the research claims not as truth-oriented statements about credibility but as *actions to be performed.*

My argument for how traditional credibility research and theory is taught and learned appears to be similar to the argument Hickson (1996) makes concerning the concepts sympathy, power and status, and quid pro quo. Hickson (1996) claims that these concepts are universal among humans. While I probably would not begin with the assumption of universality, I certainly endorse Hickson's (1996) ideas for how to teach these concepts. "Such universals should . . . be discussed and experienced utilizing the dialectic of cultural . . . How are they implemented differently in different cultures? What is the language (Spano's 'grammar') of each of these constructs?" (p. 104). Hickson goes on to suggest that teachers and students discuss "how" sympathy, power and status, and quid pro quo are performed in context. This sounds very much like the kind of discussion Alicia facilitated on source credibility.

I would add one important point here. When exploring how power, status, sympathy, and the rest operate within cultural contexts, we must also recognize that these concepts are themselves played out communicatively in the classroom. A classroom is a particular cultural context, after all, and as such it is shaped through communication processes of power, status, and the like. This suggests that we can use classroom communication to explore how supposed universal constructs are implemented and practiced within situated contexts (in

this case, "educational" contexts). We can also use the classroom to practice with our students ways of negotiating sympathy, power, status, or any other concept that piques the curiosity of the teacher as practical theorist.

Practical Theory Example 3

Practical theory involves more than the transformation of traditional theory for pedagogical purposes. In fact, practical theorists should draw on any and all available resources which will help them enlarge their communication abilities and the abilities of their students. The following example is designed to show how practical theory can facilitate teaching and learning in more spontaneous interactions. Here teachers and students deal with open-ended and fluid conversational patterns as they jointly coordinate the teaching and learning process.

- Lou's teaching and research interests are in interpersonal communication. In addition to teaching upper-division interpersonal courses, he regularly teaches the basic communication course. Recently, Lou has been studying some of the interpersonal techniques used by communication practitioners in family therapy sessions. One technique, called systemic or circular questioning, is used by therapists to get family members to think in terms of relational patterns instead of individual causes. He is curious how this type of questioning can be adapted to the basic course, so he makes a conscious effort to practice it with his students when the opportunity arises.
- One such opportunity presents itself as the class is preparing for their first major informative speech. When discussing possible topics for the assignment, one student, Martin, expresses the desire to give his

speech on computers. Lou asks Martin about his ideas for narrowing the topic and adapting it to his audience. After some initial hesitation, Martin suggests informing the class about the technology involved in the development of new high speed modems. Recognizing the obvious limitations this topic poses for a general audience, Lou decides to use the systemic questioning technique as way of teaching Martin to do audience analysis. Here is a brief excerpt from how this conversation might go:

- Lou: "Martin, I think its great that you are interested in computers and high speed modems. Who else shares your interest?"
- Martin: "Well, my friend Bill and I talk about this all the time. Most of the other computer engineering majors I know are also psyched about the new modems."
- Lou: "So if you were to give this speech in one of your computer engineering classes, the audience would know something about the topic and they would probably be interested in it?"
- Martin: "Yes, I think so."
- Lou: "Are there other groups who would be interested in your topic?"
- Martin: "People who work in the high tech industry would probably be interested. They're the ones who actually make the modems, you know."
- Lou: "Yes, that makes sense. Martin, I want you to think about our oral communication class and each of the students sitting here today. What do you think they would say about your speech topic?"

- Martin: "Hum, except for a couple of people they might say its kind of technical, I guess."
- Lou: "Imagine them actually listening to the speech. How do you think the class would respond to your information?"
- Martin: "Well, they might be confused or bored. I'm not sure."
- Lou: "It sounds like a plausible interpretation to me. Now, how might you go about changing the purpose of your speech so that its not too technical or confusing for a general audience like our class?"

The line of questioning Lou is pursuing here is based on his working hypothesis that Martin is "stuck" in an ethnocentric way of looking at the world (i.e. "what is relevant to me and the people I associate with will be relevant to everyone"). Lou, of course, can tell Martin to do a better job of analyzing his audience, but Martin might not have the ability to do this without some additional help. What is needed is a pedagogical practice that will teach Martin *how to do audience analysis*. That is, we need a practice which will enable Martin to see his speech from the perspective of the various audiences who might hear it.

While there are many ways to accomplish this objective, Lou finds systemic questioning to be especially useful. Lou also recognizes, however, that the success of this teaching practice is, in part, dependent on his own abilities to use systemic questioning in ongoing interactions with students. Put differently, his abilities will co-evolve in concert with those of his students.

FINAL THOUGHTS

In this response I have tried to clarify some of the conceptual parameters surrounding practical theory and to illustrate through a series of examples some of the ways practical theory can be used in the basic course. A couple of observations might be helpful here in summarizing practical theory. First, practical theory is not a fully formed approach to communication practice and inquiry. Moreover, practical theory will never be "fully formed" if that term is taken to mean theory as codified into a set of hierarchical ordered propositions about the world. The form of practical theory is communicative and emergent. That is, the theory emerges through ongoing communication practice and reflexive assessment.

Second, not everyone will buy into practical theory because it represents a radical departure from conventional understandings of what theory is. After reviewing the original essay, one *Annual* reviewer noted that my argument for practical theory will please those who are sufficiently emancipated from the traditional paradigm, but will probably not do much to persuade those who continue to work within it. I think this reviewer makes a valid point. So who is my audience? Who can benefit most from integrating practical theory into their teaching activities?

The primary audience I am appealing to are those who define their professional identity around the act of teaching, but for whatever reason do not see themselves as theorists, researchers, or scholars. Practical theory provides an opportunity for these teachers to use their pedagogical practices as sites for investigating how the communication process works. Communication teachers are in an excellent position to make theoretical contributions, yet there are few institutional structures which reward or even make such efforts possible (Sprague, 1993). What practical theory does is invite teachers

to use their work in pedagogy to help extend our understandings of communication and how it is taught, learned, and practiced. Practical theory is certainly not the only way to accomplish this, but it is a viable option.

Let me briefly comment on how this invitation applies to the practical theory examples mentioned earlier. First, Pamela is particularly sensitive to the dynamics of classroom communication and the language or grammar of her students. She uses her interactions with students as an opportunity for eliciting the kind of talk which will help her understand how her students communicate and how she can best move them forward into new patterns of communication. I think Pamela can tell us something about the constitutive features of human communication and how these features assist in the teaching and learning process. Second, Alicia is looking to acquire pedagogical resources to help students learn about source credibility and how to achieve it. It seems that Alicia is in a position to articulate a case study example of how credibility operates in a particular classroom situation with specific speakers, audiences, and topics. Finally, Lou works out of an interpersonal, therapeutic model of communication and applies it to his classroom teaching. I think Lou can tell us something about systemic questioning as a communication tool for teaching students and others to see how their own communication practices are shaped in complex social relationships with others.

There is also a second audience implicit in my treatment of practical theory and communication education. It consists of communication scholars who define their professional identity around research, but not teaching. This audience tends to see teaching, especially at the level of the basic communication course, as something of a distraction because it gets in the way of research. This sense of distraction is not necessarily rooted in a contempt for teaching as much as it is in the perceived separation of theory and pedagogy. Imagine a communication scholar in the field who works within a

specialized area of theory and research (e.g. social constructionism, uncertainty reduction theory, feminist theory, cultural ethnography, or media criticism). It would seem natural for the scholar to use his or her theoretical insights when engaged in pedagogical activities such as teaching the basic course. My experience, however, is that scholars all too often fail to investigate the connection between their theoretical writings and their pedagogical practices. No wonder teaching is thought to be a distraction to these research-oriented scholars!

Practical theory provides a framework for communication researchers to investigate how their theories and methods apply to the classroom context and pedagogical communication. The act of theory building, of course, also has the added benefit of advancing communication pedagogy. By foregrounding communication practice as the site of both theory and pedagogy, practical theory promises to synthesize a number of competing factions. In the original essay I framed practical theory as a way to bridge the theory-practice dichotomy in communication education. Extending that argument a bit allows us to approach teaching and research as interconnected activities. Both have the potential to mutually reinforce and enrich the other.

REFERENCES

Barber, B. R. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory democracy for a new age.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Baxter, L. A. & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics.* New York: Guilford Press.

Berger, C. R. & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental

theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1,* 99-112.

Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism: Science, hermeneutics, and praxis.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Cronen, V. E. (1995a). Coordinated management of meaning: The consequentiality of communication and the recapturing of experience. In S. Sigman (Ed.), *The consequentiality of communication* (pp. 17-65). New York: Erlbaum.

Cronen, V. E. (1995b). Practical theory and the tasks ahead for social approaches to communication. In W. L. Hurwitz (Ed.), *Social approaches to communication* (pp.217-242). New York: Guilford Press.

Cronen, V. E. (1996). *Practical theory and the logic of inquiry.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hickson, M. (1996). Rethinking our rethinking retrospectively: A rejoinder to Spano. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 8,* 97-107.

Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of pragmatism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Spano, S. (1996). Rethinking the role of theory in the basic course: Taking a "practical" approach to communication education. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 8,* 74-96.

Sprague, J. (1993). Retrieving the research agenda for communication education: Asking the pedagogical questions that are embarrassments to theory. *Communication Education, 42,* 106-122.

Stacks, D., Hickson, M. & Hill, S. R. (1991). *Introduction to communication theory.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.

Theory and Pedagogy in the Basic Course: A Summary from Spano and Hickson

Mark Hickson, III

I, too, have been pleased about the exchange of insights relative to the practical approach to teaching the basic course, as suggested by Spano (1996). While I agree with much of what Spano wrote, I am still concerned about the nature and status of some of the "theory" that has been developed and that is being developed in the discipline. To understand my overall view, however, one must review information about the nature of theory from meta-theoreticians, or critics of theory. And I think that we will find that there are some similarities between a practical view of theory and a scientific view of theory.

SCIENCE AND PRACTICE

Quintilian argued that oratory is an art. "[An] art is a power working its effects by a course, that is by method, no man will doubt that there is a certain course and method in oratory; or whether that definition, approved by almost everybody, that an art consists of perceptions consenting and cooperating to some end useful to life, be adopted by all of us, we have already shown that everything to which this definition is to be found in oratory (Bizzell & Hertzberg, p. 329). Thus, from Quintilian's perspective, oratory was seen as a *practical art*.

From a quite different perspective, discussing the "social sciences" and sociology in particular, Mazur (1968) indicated that *science* has four characteristics: (1) it is empirical (based on observation); (2) it is theoretical (can be summarized into propositions); (3) it is cumulative; and (4) it is nonethical. In a sense, these are element of "pure" science; that is, the observations are "clean" in that they are separate and apart from the motivations of the observer. Lastly, Mazur suggests that science occurs only when the "people who know the theories know more about the real world than the people who don't know theories" (p. 16). From this standpoint, certainly Spano (1996) is right in suggesting that many of the positivistic studies, from the early 1960s to the present, only tell us what Aristotle said earlier, without the use of statistics.

These two positions, though, of Quintilian and Mazur, are quite disparate views — or so it would appear. However, they also have different goals. To Mazur, science is not intuitive. One would assume, however, that Mazur believes that science is concerned with some useful end in life. The term, "useful," when used by Quintilian, could be interpreted as "practical." Thus, both science and art, according to Mazur and Quintilian, serve some practical purpose.

When I think of seemingly impractical consequences of science, I remember my days at land-grant institutions, where they taught "weed science." I often thought, *why?* What good do weeds do us? One day, meeting on a graduate student's thesis committee in "Wildlife Management," I discovered that what we call weeds, some animals call food. And some of those animals we call food, during their last days on earth. So, even weed science serves some practical purpose.

In this context, we might consider the notion: "Science makes life possible; the arts make life worthwhile." It is in this context that I must put in a word for the sciences. Certainly medical and health communication make life both possible *and* worthwhile. Obviously the debate over whether the discipline of speech communication is a science or an art

or even whether it should be an art or a science is not going to be resolved by Professor Spano nor by me. I will reiterate, however, my contention that our discipline, in the last half century, has been and continues to be a search for the answer to that question, perhaps in the contexts of several other philosophical questions.

I do not believe that any answer in these pages will change the nature of communication in the discipline, but let us take just a few more words to deal with the concepts of a practical art and a practical science. One of the differences, historically at least, has been that an art requires a certain predisposition — a *talent* if you will. Presumably, one who takes this approach believes that some people are "born with a knack" to communicate better than others. While I realize that some instructors would discount this notion, I believe that most of us who have taught public speaking for very long know that some students start out ahead of others. In large measure this is because some students are more "extroverted" than others (or perhaps they have the extroversion gene). It isn't that we believe that these individuals are better at researching a speech; what we mean is that they feel more comfortable talking before a large number of people. On the other hand, the notion of science has been viewed as some kind of democratic notion in that anyone can do science through knowledge and practice. Certainly a theory like this makes education make more sense. That is, you can only be a physician if you go to college, read, and study, and practice. On the other hand, one who has the talent to sell, for example, can do as well as high school drop-out since selling is a "knack."

In the following paragraphs, I will attempt to provide my thinking and analysis of the three points made by Spano. I am first intrigued, though, by how he arrived at his current thinking.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH: CONFLICTING OR COMPLEMENTARY?

Part of the differences in the graduate educations of Professor Spano and me appear to be related to the fact that much of mine was under the "old school." I was never taught that research was more important than teaching. I was taught only that research increased one's credibility in the classroom, if the research were relevant. I was also allowed to undertake qualitative research, which certainly was not as popular then as now. I do believe, unfortunately, that too many graduate students are given the same or similar advice to that given Spano. I am pleased that his "epiphany" was realized. And I think it is something that should be taught all graduate students. Teaching and research certainly do not have to be conflicting. Here I mean conflicting in a time sense. As an administrator, I have seen too many cases of new professors "getting off on the wrong foot" trying to uphold their service obligations, teach classes, and undertake research that often appeared to be on another planet. The time management was atrocious because the faculty member could not focus and saw no relationship between what she or he was doing and what he or she was interested in. In any case, we agree that one should undertake research that is related to teaching. If one is teaching the "wrong" course or undertaking the "wrong" research, this should be discussed with the appropriate persons.

Philosophically, I do not believe that communication is some "pie in the sky" discipline. I believe that we have often gotten off track with some multiple linear regression models of job satisfaction and communication. As well I think we have gotten off track with some postmodern analyses of the communication culture of some hypothetical corporation. I do not believe that quantitative analysts have a monopoly on abstraction, incoherence, irrelevance, dogmatism, or simple

foolishness, merely to get an article published. I do believe that the best in the business undertake practical theory and research and that they write it in a way that those who need it can understand it.

TEACHING AND COMMUNICATION PRACTICE

We have a *purpose* in the classroom. The purpose is to improve students' communication. Teaching is probably the most important of the communication practices that we, as teachers, undertake. Teaching is a form of *applied communication theory*. Using Spano's first example, it is important to analyze the audience in the classroom. Many so-called teachers tend to forget this. Instead, they teach their almost-soiled class notes from their Ph.D. programs to undergraduates so that they can use their time to write some esoteric bit of tripe for the most prestigious journal in the discipline (whatever they think it is).

In this context, it seems that one of the most important elements discussed about Pam is that she views the classroom as a place for *transaction* — for sharing. The good teacher and the good theorist certainly have one commonality: they know how to listen. Here I use listening in the generic sense of observations of verbal and nonverbal messages. Perhaps some of the best insights about communication have been formulated by Erving Goffman, a sociologist, who was a great listener of humankind — and perhaps, a practical theorist. I would agree, too, that Goffman never placed his "theories" into a series of axioms, although I think someone could probably take his work and do just that. I tend to think of the axiomatic approach more along the lines of a linear organizational pattern. Perhaps it is not reflective of the communication process, and perhaps this is part of what bothers Spano. Most people do not talk that way; most people do not think

that way. Instead we tend to think and talk in instantaneous, experientially-connected units.

For this reason, I have often wondered how a communication teacher can discuss communication as a process of interaction and/or transaction and teach completely using the one-way lecture. That same person might try to avoid students' asking questions because it may take too much time, get them "off track," and the like. But the lecture is based on the experiences of the teacher, not the student. There is often an attitude of "you must let me explain to you the difference between interaction and transaction; you have nothing to offer; and I am a busy person who must get through 15 chapters before the final examination." Practice what I say, not what I do?

CLARIFYING ASSUMPTIONS

Perhaps the core of our argument previously (Spano, 1996; Hickson, 1996), at least to me, was what are we talking about relative to "trial and error" or "starting from scratch" for the students in the basic course. In the latest work, Spano has agreed that he is discussing "something resembling trial and error" but not "starting from scratch." In a strange loopy kind of way, this semantic difference may be critical to this whole discussion. Perhaps, we are talking about trial and trial, remembering not to re-make errors (at least not on the part of the instructor). If an approach worked, we tend to use it again. If it did not work, we do not use it again. Of course, just because it worked once does not necessarily mean that it will work a second time. It appears that Professor Spano and I can agree that *most theoretical principles in communication may resemble being law-like, but are, in fact, contextual. And we may agree that theory and practice should be intermingled, under the rubric of "testing" theoretical propositions through practical, contextual exercises.* We probably also agree that a

practical approach would mean that the propositions themselves are based on experience, not merely quantified measurements of abstractions. Let me provide an example from my own teaching this quarter, albeit from an advanced theory class.

In this course we reviewed the literature, from Aristotle to the 1990s, on the concept of ethos or credibility. Students provided oral reports. The vast majority of these studies have indicated that credibility is a multi-factor phenomenon (trustworthiness and competence; character, intelligence, and good will). Unfortunately, these terms become somewhat meaningless when applied to the real world of practical rhetoric. Therefore, each member of the class was required to write a paper comparing and contrasting the credibility of two, randomly selected roles that people play (mostly occupational).

For example, how does the credibility of a rabbi compare with that of a professional gambler; a fruit picker and a college professor; a prostitute and a commercial airline pilot? What we found, through this experiential exercise, is that these generic, propositional conclusions applied generally among the conservative, legal, middle-class occupations, but they did not "fit" well with some of the others.

The entire class was also based on bio-social theory, in which we were looking at those "universals" that I mentioned in the previous article (Hickson, 1996) that humans share with other animals. But what we found here was that "context binding" appears to be a unique human trait. In a sense, we can say that context-binding is a humanistic notion, placing it favorably in the pragmatic area (James, pp. 105-118). Thus, another assumption upon which Professor Spano and I may agree is that *humans are context-bound animals.* If that assumption can be put firmly in place, it means that we are constantly searching for answers as Spano says "work[ing] the dialectical tension between stability and change." The propositions, the universals, provide the continuity, and prac-

tice provides the change, realizing that the continuity itself (the stability) is subject to the change.

RHETORIC AND COMMUNICATION IN THE BASIC COURSE

If nothing else, I hope that these four essays stimulate some new thinking about the basic course and its relationship to communication and rhetoric. I have contended elsewhere that communication and rhetoric are not the same. I have used as an example, the playing of tennis, in which the communicator tries to keep the volley going and the rhetor attempts to "win" each point as quickly as possible. Rhetoric may be fundamentally a selfish game; communication is altruistic. I think that our first two essays were rhetorical. I believe the last two are communicative. We have tried to interpret, understand, seek elucidation in these second attempts. In doing so, I hope that we have provided some thinking food for ourselves and others.

REFERENCES

Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (1990). *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present.* Boston: Bedford.

Hickson, M., III. (1996). Rethinking our rethinking retrospectively: A rejoinder to Spano. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 8,* 97-107.

James, W. (1991). *Pragmatism.* Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Mazur, A. (1968). The littlest science. *American Sociologist, 3,* 195-200.

Spano, S. (1996). Rethinking the role of theory in the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 8,* 74-96.

Teaching the Honors Public Speaking Course

Karla Kay Jensen
David E. Williams

Public universities and colleges long ago realized the need for a large scale curriculum change in order to attract and meet the needs of the nations most exceptional students. Originally, the answer was an increase in the number of honors programs which functioned as "the equivalent of educational boutiques" (Fischer, p. 108). In the 1920's Frank Aydelotte introduced the honors concept to American universities via Swathmore College. Aydelotte (1944) recounted his early plan for honors education in his book *Breaking the academic lock step: The development of honors work in American colleges and universities.*

The system of instruction which forms the subject of Aydelotte's book might be described as an extension of undergraduate freedom from the personal to the institutional sphere. It is essentially a system for selecting the best and most ambitious students, prescribing for these students a more rigorous program than would be possible for the average student, and allowing them freedom and opportunity to work out that program for themselves (p. 12).

Aydelotte's (1944) insight into the need to attract qualified honors students and provide them with a challenging, yet flexible, curriculum which emphasizes instructor-student interaction remainsl prevalent in today's honors programs. In recent years the importance of honors programs has increased due to the desire to attract the best students to our institu-

tions (Herr, 1991) and satisfy the growing number of faculty who are enthusiastic about teaching honors sections.

Honors courses in public speaking were introduced as early as the 1950's. Streeter (1960) found examples of honors speech classes for students at all college levels and "provisions for the special abilities of talented students in basic courses" (p. 223). A 1968 issue of *The Speech Teacher* devoted several articles to the topic of honors courses. Specifically, Peterson (1968) identified some of the perceived learning differences between honors and non-honors students, suggesting that honors students are more individualistic, have greater confidence, and have better organizational skills. In a separate article Gilbert (1968) advised the use of small seminars, independent reading, tutoring, and independent research to address some of these learning preferences.

As honors programs and courses have grown since the 1970's, there has been only a trace amount of research produced regarding the role of the honors public speaking course. Notable highlights include contributions by German (1985) and Wentzlaff (1988). German (1985) provided guidelines for implementing the honors course with the syllabus structured around Bloom's taxonomy for educational objectives. Wentzlaff (1988) revealed results of a study of 49 honors students. Her study discovered that most honors students studied desired collaborative and participant learning styles. She then concluded with a list of suggested honors class activities.

While these and other papers have provided some insight into the honors public speaking course, the recent exchange of information about such courses is still lacking. The present article will differ from others by identifying alternative formats for honors courses and suggesting which format would be most appropriate for different institutions. Additionally, this paper will review the literature on honors students' learning preferences, and then offer suggestions on how

honors courses might best be structured to meet the unique needs of honors students.

HONORS COURSES FORMATS AND SELECTION CRITERIA

While criteria for honors programs will differ among institutions, they share three general expecations. First, student involvement and interaction has added emphasized as a means for student learning; thus instructors are expected to foster an environment where students can discover knowledge through discussion. Second, instructors maintain elevated expectations of student work. Such expectations include greater use of primary sources, a higher expectation for creativity and individual research, and a higher standard for quality work. Third, the honors class is taught by more experienced instructors with demonstrated teaching excellence. In addition, these classes have smaller enrollments, offer a faster-paced presentation of material, and have the possibly of restricted enrollment. These general criteria are meant to ensure a teaching and learning environment most appropriate for the honors student population.

Honors Courses Formats

There are several different ways to structure honors courses. Possibly the most prevalent format is the offering of honors sections of regular courses. According to Schuman (1995) "this option is especially popular in institutions with fairly prescribed general curricula, and hence several multi-sectioned courses" (p. 27). While these sections will generally cover the same material as the regular section, they will also include additional readings and assignments and higher expectations for achievement.

A second approach allows for an enriched learning experience for the honors student within regular courses. With this option, honors students are in the same section with regular students but are given a different criteria for evaluation. For instance, the different criteria might take the form of an additional paper assignment or a special project or presentation. Honors students might also be expected to present longer speeches than usual or use a greater number of sources in their speeches. This is an easier format for institutions to use as there is no additional costs involved and the additional work for the instructor is minimal.

A third approach to teaching honors sections is the special honors course which is modeled after graduate seminars. Gabelnick (1986) noted that these courses are often interdisciplinary seminars with a thematic organization (i.e., great World orators) or a core-curriculum approach (i.e., public speaking across the curriculum). A seminar can be taught by one instructor or with a team-teaching approach. The latter format would follow a colloquium model with two or more instructors dividing the course according to their respective expertise. The team-taught seminar provides the obvious benefits of more perspectives presented to students and a shared work load for the faculty members. However, the equal division of work with regard to department or institutional teaching load requirements may take some administrative work. Enrollment in the seminars can be restricted to junior and senior level students. The upper level honors seminar is designed to build upon the content of previously taken courses. Whereas honors students should be able to step into the regular interdisciplinary honors seminar and succeed, success in the upper-level seminar should partially depend on mastery of content from previous communication (and perhaps honors) courses. Small honors seminars are often a very desirable format for both students and instructors, however, they can also be among the most expensive courses because of the lower than average student-teacher ratio.

Gabelnick (1986) describes a fourth format which can be identified as a core area seminar. This approach offers a "course or group of core courses representing an important body of information and usually organized around categories of knowledge such as the humanities, behavioral sciences, or physical sciences" (pp. 78-79). In this course (or courses) students have a reading list of key works in a particular area. When an institution utilizes this format, the core course(s) are usually required for all honors students while interdisciplinary seminars will be electives.

The honors project is the last course format which usually serves as a capstone requirement for honors programs (Schuman, 1995). The project is generally a thesis or other complex assignment which is reserved until the senior year. The project might also take the form of an oral exam, public presentation or combination of both. These projects can be either discipline focused or inter-disciplinary.

In some cases, the public speaking instructor will have control over the format which his or her course will take, but often the structure will be dictated by the department, honors program, or upper administration. Ideally, the choice of how to offer an honors public speaking course would depend on the preferences and abilities of the faculty member or members who would teach the course. However, the number of honors students, financial and administrative limitations, and the amount of time available to planning and preparation of the course will also play a major role in the decision.

Despite the format selected for the honors course, a question of elitism may surface. Honors courses may be perceived as elitist because students receive special privileges such as access to senior faculty, enrollment priority and smaller classes. The honors course is also susceptible to the image of academic snobbery. Cummings (1986) recognizes both a positive and negative element to this elitism. Negative elitism can cause animosity toward honors courses and students. Positive elitism suggests that the privileges of an honors program is

balanced by the elevated requirements placed on students' performance. Cummings (1986) suggests the following for dealing with elitism:

- Acknowledge that a degree of elitism exists in the honors program
- Foster positive elitism
- Be flexible with admissions for students who fall a little short of entrance requirements into the honors course or program
- Establish and maintain high retention.

Course Format Selection Criteria

The following is meant as an initial guideline for decision-makers to use and modify in planning the honors public speaking course at their own institutions. Estimates will be made as to the best choice in regard to four general types of institutions: small colleges with one to three sections of public speaking offered per quarter or semester, somewhat larger institutions with four to ten sections at one time, large universities with multiple sections (over 10), and institutions with high flexibility regarding teaching assignments and financial expenditures for instruction.

For smaller institutions, honors public speaking instructors should initially look toward the enriched option format. It is likely that the number of honors students who want to take public speaking at any given time would not be enough to create an autonomous section. The honors students should be allowed to enroll in the section of their choice and accept an extra assignment for honors credit. (The last section of this paper will provide suggestions of assignments which would be appropriate for the enhanced option course.)

This approach could provide an additional benefit for the students enrolled in the course. The honors student(s) may be

able to function as models for other students to observe. According to the typical academic strengths of honors students, these students should excel in the areas of research, organization, and idea development. To the extent that these strengths are apparent to the rest of the class and are seen in speeches, other students might be able to employ modeling behaviors thus improving their own speech-making abilities. While this should not be an intentionally planned and implemented element of the course, it could be a beneficial result of the enriched option public speaking course. In rare cases, particularly in an enriched public speaking course, the honors student could take on a formal mentoring role or be relied on for demonstration of certain components of the public speaking process.

Slightly larger institutions, with between four and ten sections of public speaking, will need to demonstrate a degree of flexibility in planning the honors course. When enrollment will justify an autonomous section of honors public speaking one should be offered. However, it is possible that during some terms the enrollment will be low, thus creating the need for the enriched course option.

Because of a lack of flexibility in instructor's schedules or departmental curriculum, a choice may be necessary between these two options, In such cases, the enriched option would be the preferred format as it would require the least amount of change from one term to the next. The instructor or instructors involved in enriched options of the public speaking course can then determine which assignments to offer for honors credit. While the department may not be able to offer an honors section when demand is high, it can benefit from a structured approach to the enriched option course. Through trial and error, instructors can determine which options work best for their students and meet their own pedagogical objectives.

Larger institutions with more than ten sections offered at one time will most likely want to begin with the honors

section(s) of the regular public speaking course. Institutions of this size will be able to attract enough honors students at a given time to hold, at least, one honors section. This provides the instructor with the opportunity to develop a complete syllabus tailored to the needs of the honors student. This option would also carry the advantage of not creating extra work for instructors who have one or two honors students in their section.

Larger institutions also offer the greater possibility for an interdisciplinary style seminar. While this is not the most likely means for conveying honors public speaking instruction, it is a possibility. Honors students could be enrolled in a communication course which is team taught by instructors from speech communication, mass communication, theater or other related disciplines. Blending the performance elements of public speaking with the rest of the course could be a barrier to syllabus development. The course would also have the administrative barrier of high costs and the faculty work load complications that arise from team teaching. However, the course could have high potential as an introduction to the communication discipline. Such a course designed for first year students could attract talented individuals into the communication major.

The team taught interdisciplinary seminar would become a more feasible option for specific institutions with either well-developed and supported honors programs or colleges or institutions with flexibility in instructor teaching assignments and resources. Such institutions can offer the honors student the full benefit of a team taught seminar with a small enrollment and great flexibility in the syllabus. Aside from the most closely related disciplines (i.e. mass communication) the public speaking course might be combined with business, political science, history or other disciplines. These institutions could also rely on the honors section of public speaking. They, however, would seem to have the greatest latitude for

creativity in developing and integrating public speaking across the curriculum.

HONORS STUDENTS' LEARNING PREFERENCES

Regardless of the course format, instructors must be aware of honors students' learning preferences. Previous research has provided a fairly comprehensive view of honors students learning styles and classroom tendencies (Friedman & Jenkins-Friedman, 1986; Hunt, 1979; Skipper, 1990). While much of this research is of a descriptive nature, relying on personal experience, or observation, there is also some experimental evidence which helps characterize the honors students' classroom performance.

Characteristics of Honors Students

The honors class presents a unique student population for several reasons. Most obviously, honors students have a stronger academic history than non-honors students. A review of programs suggests that most honors students received an ACT composite score of 24 or better (Jefferson, 1996; Mathiasen, 1985; Triplet, 1989). Honors students will also generally be in the top 25 percent of their high school graduating class. Some programs report a selection process which is even more restrictive to the point that entering students were, on average, in the top one percent of their high school class (Fischer, 1996).

Grove (1986) and Jefferson (1996) argued that high school achievements and future college success for honors students are a result of thoroughness in academic work and a proclivity for research. Grove (1986) further explained that honors students are "more responsible for their own learning, more self-

starting, more assiduous readers," and demonstrate "more thorough implementation of assignments, higher expectations for academic success, and more enthusiastic work attitudes" (pp. 99-100). Sharp and Johnstone (1969) also revealed that honors students thrive with independent study and research. They suggested that honors students respond positively to the opportunity to work closely with a faculty member while taking responsibility for their own education and researching a narrowly defined topic.

Honors students certainly bring many qualities to the classroom which instructors perceive as a benefit to the educational process. However, the instructor should not overlook limitations which can affect any student population. Generally speaking, honors students are not immune to immaturity, emotional changes or problems, or any other behavioral concern which could interfere with student performance (Haas, 1992).

Grove (1986) noted however, that the qualities which will generally be considered beneficial to the learning process might also cause some concern for the instructor. For example, the thoroughness found in honors students might lead to confusion. Honors students typically are quite analytical in evaluating a course assignment, thus interpreting directions in ways not intended by the instructor. Grove (1986) suggested "perhaps honors seminar students need initial direction and focus even more than do other classroom groups. Advanced, bright students understand material at many levels and are sensitive to a variety of implications and possibilities" (p. 100).

Of specific concern to instructors of public speaking is the dilemma raised by Jefferson (1996) who noted that the brightest students are not necessarily the best speakers. While it might be expected that honors students would excel in organization and content, the honors student qualities will not necessarily translate to delivery ability. In this component

of public speaking, the honors student would not be expected to excel beyond their non-honors counterparts.

It is essential that instructors do not assume that honors students will automatically excel in a public speaking course; just because a student has a 4.0 grade point average or a 30 on the ACT does not necessarily mean the student will enjoy or be skilled in speaking. As in any other classroom, instructors should expect a variety of attitudes, skills and beliefs about public speaking among students, and then be able to adapt to these specific characteristics. Even when teaching an honors course, the instructor still needs to gather such information as students' goals for the course, career goals, and previous speaking experience. Each course should be tailored to the unique needs and concerns of the class members.

Adapting Your Teaching to Meet the Needs of Honors Students

As a group, honors students may have the most varied learning strategies and preferences as individuals because they are automatically able to use the most efficient learning mode for whatever content they are studying. Consequently, regardless of the topic or the format selected for the honors course, the instructor is challenged to demonstrate a variety of instructional styles to complement the learning preferences of the honors student. "The key word in honors education is diversity — of presentation, of approach, of educational context. Those who have been teaching honors students intuitively have recognized that these students not only respond to a formal academic curriculum but will also enjoy a variety of teaching strategies" (Gabelnick, p. 85).

This would suggest that the honors instructor who can demonstrate a competency with a variety of presentation styles will have a better chance of meeting the needs of honors students. Balancing dynamic lecture and discussion tech-

niques with a variety of activities which incorporate the various learning modes will allow students to learn most effectively.

Friedman (1986) suggested that honors instructors might also wish to consider the use of peer teaching. This rationale is based on the recognition that many honors students anticipate careers in teaching. Friedman (1986) contended that by their senior year, honors students will have the competency to help beginning students learn material. By serving this peer-instructional role, the honors student can learn for him or herself and facilitate the learning process of other students. Possibilities for peer teaching include allowing the honors student to lead discussions or seminar meetings, enrolling the honors student in a concurrent independent study to prepare for peer teaching, and implementing a modified new teacher training system similar to what is provided for new graduate teaching assistants (Fleuriet & Beebe, 1996; Roach & Jensen, 1996).

The notion of independent study was also alluded to by Skipper (1990) who researched the learning styles of higher conceptual level students. Skipper's research revealed a difference in learning style preferences with students at lower conceptual ability levels. Findings confirmed Hunt's (1975) conceptual level hypothesis as Skipper (1990) noted "students at higher conceptual levels are structurally more complex, more capable of independent action, and more capable of adapting to a changing environment than students at a lower conceptual level" (p. 9). He explained that honors students, especially in their senior year, were more appreciative of instructors who emphasized teaching through simulation, library work, and independent learning.

A final insight into the instructor's need to have an arsenal of available instructional styles can be gleaned from the research of Mathiasen (1985) which revealed the pleasant yet predictable results that honors students have good study habits, good attitudes, and are achievement oriented. How-

ever, he warned that "although these students wanted to obtain good grades and do better than other students, they refused to accept passively teaching practices they opposed" (p. 173). This would suggest that the instructor not only needs to be able to utilize a variety of teaching styles for different learning styles but also needs to be able to quickly recognize when one approach is not working and immediately adapt. While this could be said for any type of student audience, Mathiasen's (1985) research suggested that the honors students' reaction to an ineffective teaching style will be faster and more pronounced than that of a non-honors peer.

COURSE STRUCTURE AND COMPONENTS

The structure and composition of the honors public speaking course will vary greatly depending on which format is being used. For example, an enriched option public speaking course will not offer the exact same projects and assignments or the same number of honors-oriented assignments as an autonomous honors section of public speaking. However, in creating the honors public speaking course, in whatever form it takes, the instructor should "balance the rigor of analysis and the exorbitance of creativity" (Brown, p. 4).

To design a rigorous course, instructors might follow the recommendation of German (1985) who noted that when teaching the honor public speaking course, "instructors can design a single course that begins with lower level cognitive abilities and then progresses rapidly to the higher cognitive skills" (p. 4). German (1985) relied on the work of Bloom (1956) to show that the instructor should move quickly from course content which stresses knowledge, comprehension, and application to content which stresses, the cognitive elements of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

The following activities outline a variety of course components which could be offered in an honors public speaking

section or as part of an enriched option or interdisciplinary honors section with public speaking. No matter what type of honors format is implemented these activities can be incorporated as they are presented or adapted to meet the needs of your class and its format. Naturally, these activities can be used in non-honors sections of public speaking. We have found, however, considering the usual smaller class size and eagerness of students to be highly involved in the class, these particular exercises are more effective and beneficial to a class of honors students.

SPEAKER'S RESOURCE

The speaker's resource is an assignment which should be introduced approximately the second week of the course. This assignment is an expanded version of the traditional speaker's notebook which is a compilation of interesting topics or pithy stories which could be used for a variety of speaking engagements.

The speaker's resource assignment asks students to prepare a one to three page written report about a "great work" or "work of great significance." The students should select a work to read which they deem to be of great importance. The choice could range from a great piece of literature (e.g. Homer's Iliad, Dante's Inferno) to a significant book or manuscript in their particular major or area of interest. The student would be given several weeks to complete the assignment, possibly to the end of the term.

The student will submit his or her report and in turn receive a copy of every other student's report. Thus, at the end of the assignment period the student will have a synopsis for many different "great works." The student can then select from these reports the works he or she would like to read next. The instructor merely has the responsibility of conveying to students the importance of being a knowledgeable speaker. It is then up to the student to make use of the oppor-

tunity to use the speaker's resource. If the instructor chooses, each new honors class could receive the accumulated copies of previous students reports. This would create a large storehouse of material to be given to students after just a few terms of the assignment.

The purpose of the assignment is two-fold. Initially, it is based on the belief that excellent speakers have a wealth of knowledge to draw from. This is a classical rhetorical concept which can be added to the honors public speaking course. The second purpose of the assignment is to promote lifelong learning. In one class, students will receive a reading list which would take a great deal of time to complete. While some students may not follow up on the entire reading list, the instructor has at least provided a means and a rationale for continuing to learn outside of the classroom.

This assignment would likely appeal to the honors students because it provides the opportunity to do individual research into a primary source. To further appeal to the needs of the honors student, the instructor can emphasize that the report should not just give an overview of the work, but also offer a critique or some other type of evaluation. This element of the assignment will move the student toward the more complex cognitive levels and increase their personal interest level in the project.

IMPROMPTU SPEAKING

Impromptu speaking is certainly not an assignment which is exclusive to the honors course. However, a more challenging variation on the assignment would make it more appropriate for honors students. Williams, Carver and Hart (1993) devised a variation of impromptu speaking which they call reasoned response. In reasoned response, the student is provided with more information than the standard impromptu quotation. The reasoned response prep slip will

provide a hypothetical location, speaker's role, and situation. For example, the prep slip might say:

Location:	Lawrence, Kansas
Speaker's Role:	Candidate for Mayor
Situation:	You are giving a "stump speech" to senior citizens on why you should be mayor.

The student now has the greater challenge of developing speech content which is tailored to a specific audience instead of the generic classroom audience. The normal impromptu challenge of thinking quickly and delivering a smooth speech on short notice is still in the assignment.

This assignment can be conducted a few times during the course to allow students to gauge their development in thinking and organizational skills, as well as challenging their audience analysis and adaptation skills. The assignment fits the needs of the honors students as it provides an additional challenge to their knowledge and ability and requires the higher level abilities of analysis and synthesis. The assignment can be tailored to fit either the student's major area of study or current regional or national news events. One key to the success of this assignment is to convey to the students that they should rely on their reasoning ability and previous knowledge of the location or situation to respond to the prep slip.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

German (1985) and Wentzlaff (1988) suggested the use of a debate activity in the classroom. One limitation of using debate in public speaking is determining how to modify the activity to function in a two to four week period. The answer to this dilemma may be found in the growing popularity of parliamentary debate. Parliamentary debate is a team oriented debate activity which is modeled after the British

House of Parliament. Therefore, instead of competing as affirmative and negative, the opposing teams are the government and opposition. The topic for each debate is different and no research is conducted on the topic as students are given only 15 minutes to prepare for the activity after receiving the resolution.

Students are asked to use their knowledge and persuasive skill to either propose or oppose the resolution. The government and opposition alternate sides with a total of four constructive speeches about the resolution. The opposition then offers a rebuttal followed by the government rebuttal which concludes the debate. The complete functioning of parliamentary debate will not be described here as there are other sources which do so (Appendix, 1992; Epstein, 1992; Williams & Jensen 1997).

This activity should be conducted toward the end of the term as it greatly challenges the students' ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate not only what they are saying but what their opponents are saying as well. This activity would be enjoyed by the honors student because of the challenge it offers as well as the ability to use knowledge from a variety of previous classes. This activity would also provide variety to the presentation assignment which would likely be appreciated by the honors student. The nature of responding to another's speech and creating arguments spontaneously changes the "speech assignment" in a way that the honors student must rise to an increased level of expectation.

THE PUBLIC SPEAKING PORTFOLIO

A Public Speaking Portfolio can be used to help honors students personalize the learning experience and become more mindful of their communication and continued progress toward competence during the term. The portfolio assignment can include only one or all three of the following components:

a journal, collected artifacts, and a videotape of their own speeches.

Videotape. A first component of the Public Speaking Portfolio is the videotape. Students are asked to record consecutively each of their speeches on one videotape. After each speech, students review their performances and evaluate them in their journal. Then, after the last speech, all the performances are viewed in succession and another journal entry is made concerning the overall accomplishments over the course of the semester. By viewing themselves on tape, students will see that they can organize and deliver a speech, reason and defend an argument, and notice consistent improvements between each speech.

Journals. Journal writing can help engage and guide students on their path toward being more competent communicators. Instructors can simply ask students to record daily or weekly reflections about what occurred in class or questions can be more structured such as: 1. What were the thesis and main ideas of the day?; 2. What idea did we discuss that you were most interested in?; 3. What questions do you have about the topics covered? Structured questions can also help students link the course material to the personal, scholastic, and social dimensions of their lives. For instance instructors might ask: 1. How is this material connected to material we've already covered in this class?; 2. How is this material connected to material you've studied in other classes?; 3. How is this material connected to what is presently happening in your own life or in the world?

Journals can also include a "Speech Process Log" for each speech. These logs capture for display and reflection the activities, time and effort put forth during speech creation. To encourage active reflection, students are required to keep an on-going tally of their efforts as they progress through each of the following areas of the speech-making process, as well as the time spent in each activity such as brainstorming, researching, outlining or practicing. Following the presenta-

tion of each speech, the student reviews the log to analyze the speech preparation process. Students also evaluate the actual performance by viewing the videotape and reading comments from peers and the instructor. Next, using the information recorded in the Speech Process Log, students analyze the speech-making process: How effective was it? What worked well? What would have worked better had different decisions been made, time used differently, etc.?

Collected Artifacts. This portfolio component is a collection of items which show students' miscellaneous accomplishments, technical mastery and knowledge integration. Such artifacts include, but are not limited to, peer evaluations and teacher evaluations of each speech, completed paper assignments and other course activities and class notes. Students can also be encouraged to be mindful when reading newspapers and magazines and watching the news so that they may include examples of communication or specific public speaking occasions in their portfolio (i.e., a newspaper clipping or summary of a news program). Finally, the "artifacts" component might include the PRCA (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) (McCroskey & Richmond, 1989) which the students could complete at the beginning and end of the term.

As a unit, the videotape, the journal and the collected artifacts help students see their continuous progress toward public speaking competence. The Public Speaking Portfolio allows honor students to do what they enjoy and excel in — specifically, being more active in the learning process and moving beyond simply recognizing material, to having the responsibility of synthesizing and evaluating course concepts as well as their own performances.

ADDING CLASS INVOLVEMENT TO INFORMATIVE AND PERSUASIVE SPEECHES

Because honors students enjoy being active in the classroom, simply sitting quietly on speech days might be a frustration. Even if they are required to critique class speeches, honors students may want more hands-on involvement on speech days. The following are suggestions to provide an extra challenge for all students, even if it isn't their day to present a speech.

Introductions. Before every speech each speaker will be introduced by another student who isn't presenting an informative or persuasive speech that day. Assignments of who is introducing whom should be made well in advance of the speaking date so that the "introducer" can interview the speaker. Introductions, which might be from 30 to 90 seconds long, should set the stage by establishing the significance of the speech or the topic, as well as highlight the speaker's credibility. The introduction might also contain some biographical information about the speaker.

Formal Questioning. Two to four students can be chosen for each speech to be the "formal questioners." Assignments of who will fill the role of questioners should be made in advance of the speech so that those who will be posing questions may gather information on the topic in order to be well informed. The questioner's purpose is not to interrogate the speaker, but simply to think critically about the material and have practice formulating well-stated questions. Naturally, speakers will also have the added challenge of responding to those questions.

Pre-speech, Post-speech Questionnaires. The final suggestion for encouraging involvement is through an attitude measurement before and after every speech. Each student is responsible for creating a questionnaire to measure fellow students' beliefs, attitudes and values about their speech topic. The questionnaires, which could be completed either in

class or outside of class time, should include several types of questions such as fixed-alternative, open-ended or Likert scales. Completed before the speech, the questionnaires can serve as an audience analysis tool. Completed after the speech, students can measure the amount of change that occurred as a result of their speech. Knowing that they will be completing a questionnaire encourages all students to pay closer attention to each speech and gives a greater sense of audience involvement.

Each of the above described activities is designed to empower honors students in their learning process by providing maximum involvement and use of higher level thinking skills. Using a wide variety of active learning techniques can help promote the dynamic, hands-on approach to learning which honors students require and appreciate to reach their fullest potential.

CONCLUSION

Knowing the variety of honors courses formats, honors students' characteristics and learning preferences and some ideas for restructuring the typical public speaking course to best accommodate honors students, can be the first steps toward creating a new honors course or re-structuring an existing course. The honors student comes to the public speaking class with a unique set of needs and preferences which require alterations to the traditional course. Considering format and content changes can create the added challenge and participatory experience which helps improve honors education.

REFERENCES

Appendix (1992). *Parliamentary Debate, 1,* 81-105.

Aydelotte, F. (1944). *Breaking the academic lockstep.* New York: Harper and Row.

Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals.* New York: David McKay Co.

Brown, B. (1994). *The rigor and exorbitance of reading: Teaching critical thinking in the freshman honors seminar.* Proceedings of the National Conference on Successful College Teaching, Orlando, FL.

Cummings, R. J. (1986). Exploring values, issues and controversies. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jerkins-Friedman (Eds.). *Fostering academic excellence through honors programs* (pp. 17-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Epstein, S. (1992). What parliamentary debate can offer small programs. *Parliamentary Debate, 1,* 51-60.

Fischer, D. (1996, September. 16). The new honors programs. *US News and World Report,* 108-110.

Fleuriet, C. A., & Beebe, S. A. (1996, November). *TA training for the Basic Course: Principles, practices and strategies.* Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, CA.

Friedman, P. (1986). Independent study, fieldwork and peer teaching. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jerkins-Friedman (Eds.), *Fostering academic excellence through honors programs* (pp. 87-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Friedman, P. G., & Jenkins-Friedman, R. C. (1986). Implications for fostering excellence. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jerkins-Friedman (Eds.), *Fostering academic excellence through honors programs* (pp. 109-113). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Friedman, P. G. & Jenkins-Friedman, R. C. (Eds.). (1986). *Fostering academic excellence through honors programs: New directions for teaching and learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gabelnick, F. (1986). Curriculum design: The medium is the message. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jerkins-Friedman (Eds.). *Fostering academic excellence through honors programs* (pp. 75-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

German, K. (1985). *Guidelines for implementing an honors program in communication.* Paper presented at the Midwest Basic Course Directors Conference, Indianapolis, IN.

Gilbert, J. (1968). Honors for the best. *The Speech Teacher, 17,* 193-195.

Grove, T. G. (1986). Leading the honors seminar: Applied group dynamics. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jerkins-Friedman (Eds.). *Fostering academic excellence through honors programs* (pp. 99-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haas, P. F. (1992). Honors programs: Applying the reflective judgment model. *Liberal Education, 78,* 20-23.

Herr, N. E. (1991). Perspectives and policies of undergraduate admissions committees regarding advanced placement and honors coursework. *College and University,* 47-54.

Hunt, D. E. (1979). Learning style and student needs: An introduction to conceptual level. National Association of secondary school principals (Ed.). *Student Learning Styles,* pp. 27-39, Reston, VA.

Jefferson, P. A. (1996). *Honors in the basic speech course: A model of research, conceptualization, and implementation.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Mathiasen, R. E. (1985). Characteristics of the college honors student. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26,* 171-173.

McCroskey, J. C. & Richmond, V. P. (1989). *Communication apprehension: Avoidance, and effectiveness* (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers.

Peterson, O. (1968). Teaching the honors course in fundamentals of speech. *The Speech Teacher, 17,* 196-198.

Roach, K. D. & Jensen, K. K. (1996). *GTA training: Roles, responsibilities and resources.* Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, CA.

Schuman, S. (1995). *Beginning in honors: A Handbook* (3rd ed.). National Collegiate Honors Council. Morris, MN: U. of Minnesota.

Sharp, H., Jr. & Johnstone, C. (1969). Independent study for undergraduates. *Speech Teacher, 18,* 308-311.

Skipper, C. E. (1990). *Conceptual level development in higher ability college students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Education Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Streeter, D. (1960). Speech and the superior student. *The Speech Teacher, 9,* 223-226.

Wentzlaff, S. L. (1988). *Honors students and a basic speech communication course: Techniques for meeting their needs.* Paper presented at the Midwest Basic Course Directors Conference, Dayton, OH.

Williams, D. E., Carver, C. T. & Hart R. D. (1993). Is it time for a change in impromptu speaking? *The National Forensic Journal, 11,* 29-40.

Williams, D. E. & Jensen, K. K. (in press). Introducing parliamentary debate in the public speaking course. In L. W. Hugenberg & B. S. Moyer (Eds.). *Teaching ideas for the basic communication course.*

The Research Foundation for Instruction in the Beginning Public Speaking Course*

Lawrence W. Hugenberg
Barbara S. Moyer

The history of communication education in the basic communication course is relatively short. Yet, the writings of Aristotle, Cicero, Plato, and Isocrates continue to dominant instruction and practice in the beginning public speaking course. The "ghosts" of these ancient rhetoricians continue to determine pedagogy in beginning public speaking courses. Yoder and Wallace (1995), in their Central States Communication Association Basic Course Committee award-winning paper, "What If Aristotle Had Never Lived," stressed the ongoing emphasis on Aristotle in teaching communication students. Frentz (1995), in his Southern States Communication Association Presidential Address, stated: "After 2500 years of fleeing our shadow, there are few places left to run. With nowhere to go and no time left to get there, we need to try something different. But what?" (SPECTRA). Although referring to our discipline's image in the social and behavioral sciences, Frentz's lament is also applicable to what instructors do in beginning public speaking courses. The history and current status of the beginning or basic course in communication has been documented several times (see recent issues of *The Basic Communication Course Annual).* These studies,

* This article is a revision of a paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention, April 1997, St. Louis, MO. The authors would like to thank William J. Seiler, University of Nebraska - Lincoln for his comments in revising the paper.

along with a deliberate reading of popular public speaking textbooks, show the typical public speaking course to be dependent on the teachings of classical rhetoric for teaching students ways to develop and improve their communication skills. In other articles in the *Basic Communication Course Annual,* authors bemoan the fact that research on our instructional content and practices needs to be reflected in our texts and our classrooms. However, no one has attempted to articulate what research base exists for our instructional practices.

The basic public speaking course remains the most popular basic communication course. The latest survey (Gibson, et al., 1990), indicated that over 56% of speech communication departments offer the public speaking course as its basic course. Instructors' assumptions that the skills taught in the beginning public speaking course increase student communication competence are also suspect. The reason for these doubts was articulated clearly by John Daly in his opening remarks to the participants of the Speech Communication Association 1994 Summer Conference on Communication Assessment. He indicated that the way communication instructors teach communication skills is not supported by research reported in our scholarly journals. He claimed this lack of research base creates major public relations nightmares for speech communication. This is especially true in light of the fact that for most students and many non-communication faculty on our campuses, the basic communication course is their only introduction to the communication discipline.

Additionally, Ivie and Lucaites (1995), responding to Frentz's concerns, stated "It [the communication discipline] thus concerns itself with the pragmatics of everyday discourse — with the study of how we use verbal and nonverbal symbols to convey ideas and attitudes persuasively in order to manage differences of opinion on matters of import" (p. 14). We agree

with this fundamental description of communication instruction.

RESEARCH METHODS

With this in mind, the textbooks for the public speaking course seem a logical place to begin our review of the research base for public speaking instruction. We examined the research base communication scholars claim supports how we teach public speaking. We examined the research foundations of instruction for three elements important in beginning public speaking courses. We focused on the explanations of persuasive speaking, informative speaking, and audience analysis and adaptation in popular public speaking textbooks. Our specific research questions are:

[R1] Is what we teach in the basic public speaking course about persuasive speaking supported by research findings?

[R2] Is what we teach in the basic public speaking course about informative speaking supported by research findings?

[R3] Is what we teach in the basic public speaking course about audience analysis and audience adaptation supported by research findings?

We examined these texts in a two-step process. First, we examined the appropriate portions in the textbooks. We used the glossaries in each book to guide our selection of data for review. Second, we examined the research base reported by the authors supporting their claims about persuasive speaking, informative speaking, and audience analysis and adaptation. We include representative samples of claims in the textbooks reviewed; we in no way want the reader to believe that these are the only unsupported claims. We also want the

reader to understand that there are claims that authors support with references. However, the references included to support some claims cite other textbooks or quote someone's opinion. There is little research cited that was designed to prove the claims.

PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

A common assignment in public speaking classes is the persuasive speech. Authors offer students a plethora of "how-to" suggestions on designing, preparing, and delivering a persuasive speech. The following is a representative list of author claims about how to design, prepare, and deliver a persuasive speech. The claims reported below are unsubstantiated because they lack supporting materials.

Unsupported Claims

- "People change gradually, in small degrees over a long period."
- "As a general rule, never ask the audience to do what you have not done yourself. So, demonstrate your own willingness to do what you want the audience to do."
- "As a public speaker, you have two major concerns with respect to reasoning. First, you must make sure your reasoning is sound. Second, you must try to get listeners to agree with your reasoning."
- "Once you establish your overall persuasive goals, you must then decide the type and direction of the change you seek."
- "Propositions are necessary because persuasion always involves more than one point of view."

- "Evidence is more likely to be persuasive if it is new to the audience."
- "Leadership is a more important issue in persuasive than informative speaking."
- "How successful you are in any particular persuasive speech will depend above all on how well you tailor your message to the values, attitudes, and beliefs of your audience."
- "If your listeners see you as competent, knowledgeable, of good character, and charismatic or dynamic, they will think you credible. As a result, you will be more effective in changing their attitudes or moving them to do something."
- "Persuasion is more likely to take place when your audience has a positive attitude toward your goal, so it is crucial to assess the direction and strength of audience attitudes about your topic in general and specific goal in particular."
- "Therefore, it [the Motivated Sequence] is especially suited for speeches that have action as their goal."
- "It [the Motivated Sequence] follows the process of human thinking and leads the listener step by step to the desired action."
- "Persuasion is impossible without attention."
- "Explanations in the form of statistics (etc) . . . ensure that your audience understands exactly what you mean."
- "Understanding the basis for Maslow's hierarchy is critical to your success as a persuasive speaker, for if you approach your listeners at an appropriate level of need, you will find them unable or unwilling to respond."
- "Good organization will improve your credibility. So will appropriate, clear, vivid language. So will fluent,

dynamic delivery. So will strong evidence and cogent reasoning."

- "Present vivid images of the need for action. Show your listeners how the quality of their lives — how even their survival — depends on prompt action."

INFORMATIVE SPEAKING

A second major assignment in the public speaking course is the informative speech. We examined the claims advanced to help students design, prepare, and deliver informative speeches. The following are representative claims typical of all unsupported claims in the textbooks reviewed. In this section, claims used by the authors to explain the preparation and delivery of informative speeches are presented.

Unsupported Claims

- "Things that are personally related to our needs or interests attract our attention."
- "The power of informative speaking to influence our perceptions can serve a pre-persuasive function, preparing us for later persuasive speaking."
- "If you want the audience to listen to your speech, be sure to relate your information to their needs, wants, or goals."
- "Generate enough interest in the information to arouse the audience's attention."
- "To be effective, speeches of explanation must be connected to the real world."
- ". . . to increase the likelihood that your audience will listen to you, make sure that you are perceived as being credible."

- "A responsible informative speech should cover all major positions on a topic and present all vital information."
- "Audiences are more likely to show interest in, understand, and remember information that is presented creatively."
- "Avoid telling your audience what it already knows . . . they don't want to hear what they already know."
- "All people have a deep-seated hunger for knowledge and insight. Part of the informative speaker's job is to feed this hunger."
- "Tie key points to anecdotes and humor."
- "Humorous stories are effective in helping the audience remember material."
- "Asking your audience to absorb new information presented in a disorganized fashion is asking too much."
- "Audio visual aids will help you describe almost anything."

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS AND ADAPTATION

In addition to the claims about how to design, prepare, and deliver persuasive and informative speeches, many claims about audience analysis and adaptation are included. The following lists of claims explaining audience analysis and adaptation were discovered in each of the textbooks.

Unsupported Claims

- "Now let us consider the specific areas in which it is most important to have accurate data [for audience analysis]: age, education, gender, occupation, income, race, religion, and nationality, geographic uniqueness, and group affiliations."

- "You need to gather as much information as you can about these factors [demographics] as you plan and prepare your speech."
- "Different age-groups have different attitudes and beliefs largely because they have had different experiences in different contexts. . . . Young people have strong needs to be evaluated positively by their peer group — group identification is very important to the young."
- "You are also likely to find a well-educated audience more open minded, more willing to at least listen to new proposals, and more accepting of social and technological changes than less well-educated audiences."
- "Knowing which social groups are represented in your audience and what they stand for is important for effective audience adaptation."
- "By finding out the average age of your listeners, you can avoid being on one side of the age gap and having your audience on the other."
- "Information about your audience's beliefs, attitudes, and values can be vital in planning your speech."
- "For either informative or persuasive speeches, education level is an excellent predictor of audience interest and knowledge."
- "You can better estimate your listeners' knowledge of and interest in a topic from their educational level than from their age or gender."
- "Gender role differences do exist and generalizations based on these differences are not necessarily wrong . . . also a fact that more men than women are sports fans."
- "Traditionally, men have been found to place greater importance on theoretical, economic, and political values. . . . women are generally more relationally

oriented than men are. Women express their feelings more readily than men do."

- "You can determine how much your listeners know about your topic by the nature of the occasion."
- "This advice is based on a sound psychological principle: The more different kinds of explanation a speaker gives, the more listeners will understand."
- ". . . when speakers fail to realize that religious beliefs may also define moral attitudes about issues like abortion [etc.] . . . they risk alienating their audience."
- "You need to consider and address differences of opinion [such as racial or ethnic ties]."
- "Because people often identify themselves in terms of their work, it is important to know the types of jobs or the nature of the work they do."
- "Understanding your audience attitudes, beliefs, and values will help you put your message in terms most likely to succeed."
- "The following suggestions will help you build the types of audience connection that defines the reciprocal nature of public speaking . . . . Get to the point quickly . . . have confidence your audience wants to hear you speak."
- "If you can appeal to the common values in your speeches to a diverse audience, you can often unite your listeners behind your ideas or suggestions."

DISCUSSION

What can we conclude about the research foundations of the authors' discussions of persuasive speaking, informative speaking, and audience analysis and adaptation? There are several conclusions we believe to be supported by our review of the textbooks.

Conclusion #1

Our first conclusion is based on our observation that there are many unsupported assertions included in public speaking texts. Defenders of this approach to writing about speaking suggest that these are common sense ideas to the preparation and delivery of a speech. The "common sense" rationale is not sufficient to warrant the boldness with which the authors make their claims. Defenders also suggest that this practice does little, if any, harm in the classroom. The central question remains, however, that unsupported claims offered as practical advice for students need proper research support or need to be identified as something other than fact.

Since many these claims are not supported, it is inconceivable to us that they are advanced as if they were fact. They are not fact; they are mere conjecture seemingly based on tradition and historic practice. These conjectures need to be presented as just that — mere conjectures. It would be better to admit that these ideas are simply pieces of advice based on the rich tradition of teaching public speaking and\or a wealth of practical experience. Defenders of this approach might argue that the claims do not need supporting research. Are we willing to simply accept this position?

The fact remains: *the claims in each of the texts offer little research-based advice to the student-speaker for a successful speech.* Translating unsubstantiated claims from a text to practice is difficult.

Conclusion #2

The overall concern of communication teachers in the beginning public speaking course is to teach students the theories, skills, and practices of public speaking. Offering students platitudes and poorly-supported assertions do not

prepare them for the public speaking situation. Communication educators need to remember they are not writing bumper stickers or sayings for greeting cards, they are trying to instruct students in "the art of public speaking."

Communication educators need to help students increase their communication competence as public speakers. The multiple unsupported claims offered in texts offer the student no proven practice techniques or public speaking skills to help them increase their competence. Public speaking competence, as a goal of instruction in the beginning communication course, seems reasonable. *There are little data or few claims included in any of the texts reviewed that offer students ways of being more competent public speaker.*

There is little information in any of the texts, even when the author offers some documentation, that test the authors' claims related to public speaking preparation and practice. Several authors cite Monroe, *et al.* as support for the Motivated Sequence. Others cite Maslow as the source for using the needs hierarchy in the speech preparation process; whether in persuasive speaking or audience analysis. Citing other authors who created an idea but failed to prove it or other testimonials seems weak support for the broad generalizations suggested in the texts as the way to prepare and present public speeches. Another option is that the research is ignored in the preparation of our texts. If the research is there, then it should be reported.

Conclusion #3

In our opinion, if the instructors received such unsupported and unsubstantiated claims in a student paper, they would find that unacceptable. Each text includes a major section or chapter on the use and importance of supporting materials. If we held the claims advanced in public speaking texts up to the scrutiny of the authors' suggestions for using

supporting materials, how would they measure up? It seems to us that the claims would not pass.

It is curious that communication educators conclude that offering unsubstantiated claims in the name of "teaching public speaking" is acceptable. Not only would these same people not accept this practice in papers from their students, editors of communication journals would not accept this practice from authors of manuscripts. *This practice is acceptable in textbooks for the basic public speaking course.* To accept poor or weak documentation in communication textbooks suggests that instruction in the beginning public speaking course is not nearly as important as some of these other activities or in need of any justification.

Conclusion #4

The claim advanced by John Daly during the 1994 SCA Summer Conference that little evidence exists to support how we teach beginning oral communication skills is consistent with our analysis. There is little support offered for the ways public speaking is taught. We are not concluding that all claims are unsupported; there are claims that are supported and, therefore, appear more credible. However, based on our review, most of the claims advanced about public speaking instruction are unsupported.

This should be an area of great concern for communication educators interested in the basic course. Research needs to be conducted to test the advice offered to students to improve their public speaking competencies. Communication researchers owe this to the students in the beginning public speaking course, the instructors teaching these courses, as well as to the communication discipline.

The fact that these claims are not supported is an obvious gap in our research. It causes us to pause and ask why does this gap exist. Perhaps the basic communication course is not

viewed to be as important as other research interests by communication scholars. Although speculation on our part, there is evidence that the basic communication course is not too important. First, most of these sections are taught by less experienced instructors — graduate teaching assistants who receive inconsistent training and must rely heavily on the textbook as their source of instructional information. Second, there is a lack of scholarly research in communication journals studying the teaching of public speaking. Most of the research on the basic course is opinion-based, based on personal preference or personal experience.

Conclusion #5

The research we are calling for in the basic course is not difficult to conduct. Many unsupported assertions can be tested. Here are a few research questions that could be tested rather easily:

- Is the Motivated Sequence a useful tool for the speaker and the audience in a persuasive communication context?
- Will the speaker be more successful if they adapt their speech to their listeners' demographics? Values? Attitudes?
- Are listeners more likely to be involved in the public speaking situation if they "like" the topic?

Some research questions have been studied. The problem is that many of the results of this research are not cited in the textbooks. In seeking answers to these questions and reporting the results, scholars would advance our current understandings of public speaking pedagogy and practice. Is there a fear that if these research questions are studied, we might discover that they are not be supported? Regardless of any

fear, communication educators must get involved with instructional research and provide the research results that support claims advanced in our public speaking textbooks. If we commence this line of research, students can learn and practice public speaking skills with confidence and we can hold our heads high as communication educators.

REFERENCES

Frentz, T. (1995). Presidential address: Southern States Communication Association, *SPECTRA*.

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S. & Leichty, G. (1990). The basic speech course at Unites States colleges and universities: V. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2,* 233-257.

Ivie, R. L. & Lucaites, J. L. (1995). Response to T. Frentz. *SPECTRA*.

Yoder, D. D. & Wallace, S. P. (1995). *What if Aristotle had never lived?* Paper presented during the Central States Communication Association Convention, Indianapolis, IN.

Author Identifications

Marybeth G. Callison is a graduate student in Interpersonal Communication at Georgia State University. She teaches public speaking and a hybrid basic communication course. She received the Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant Award in 1995 from the Georgia State University Department of Communication. Her research interests include student motivation, children's communication competence, verbal aggressiveness, and relationship development.

Karen Freisem (M.A., M.A.T., University of Washington) is an instructional consultant and language specialist at the Center for Instructional Development and Research at the University of Washington. She works with international teaching assistants (TAs) to help them enhance their language proficiency and communication skills in the context of their TA roles. Her research interests focus on developing the teaching effectiveness of international TAs.

Michael Z. Hackman (Ph.D., University of Denver) is a Professor of Communication at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs. His research interests include humor, leadership, creativity and communication, and cross cultural communication.

Katherine G. Hendrix (Ph.D., University of Washington) is an Assistant Professor of Communication at the University of Memphis and has directed the basic course for the past three years. Her classroom experience includes community and

college level teaching. Her research interests include graduate teaching assistant socialization and professor credibility.

Mark Hickson, III (Ph.D., Southern Illinois University) is Professor in and Chair of the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. His research interests include nonverbal communication, communication theory, and communication education.

Lawrence W. Hugenberg (Ph.D., The Ohio State University) is Professor of Communication and Director of basic courses and video lab at Youngstown State University. He is a past chair of the National Communication Association Basic Course Commission and the Central States Communication Association Basic Course Committee. He has published articles related to and co-authored several textbooks for the basic communication course. His research interests include communication assessment, the basic communication course, organizational communication, and communication pedagogy.

Karla Kay Jensen (Ph.D., University of Kansas) is an Assistant Professor and Director of the Basic Course at Texas Tech University. Her research interests are in basic course, GTA training, and pedagogical issues.

Charles A. Lubbers (Ph.D., University of Nebraska - Lincoln) is an Assistant Professor in the A. Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications at Kansas State University. His research interests are in the area of intercultural communication and he has conducted research on the basic course in communication studies departments as well as mass communication programs.

Sherwyn P. Morreale (Ph.D., University of Denver) is an Associate Director of the National Communication Association. She is the former Director of the Center for Excellence in

Oral Communication at the University of Colorado, Colorado springs. Her research interests include public speaking pedagogy, the assessment of oral communication competence, and gender communication.

Barbara S. Moyer (M.A., Kent State University) is a doctoral student in the Department of Interpersonal Communication at Bowling Green State University. Her research interests include the basic communication course, family communication, and rhetorical criticism.

Michael R. Neer (Ph.D., University of Missouri) is an Associate Professor at the University of Missouri at Kansas City. His research interests include communication apprehension, assessment, and argumentative processes.

Brooke L. Quigley (Ph.D., University of Washington) is an Assistant Professor of Communication at the University of Memphis. She has taught a variety of introductory and upper division courses and has produced videotapes designed to enhance instruction. Her research focuses on the areas of instructional development and media criticism.

Kristi A. Schaller (Ph.D., Ohio University) is an Assistant Professor of Communication at Georgia State University. She teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in interpersonal communication as well as undergraduate business and professional communication, human communication, and public speaking courses. Her primary research interest is in instructional communication, particularly teacher-student communication and student learning. Other research interests include communication patterns on urban campuses and teaching assistant training.

William J. Seiler (Ph.D., Purdue University) is a Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication Studies at

the University of Nebraska - Lincoln. He is the author of several textbooks including one on classroom communication. He has a long line of research concerning the basic course, especially as it applies to the basic course using the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI).

Shawn Spano (Ph.D., Indiana University) is an Associate Professor of Communication Studies at San Jose State University. In addition to teaching the basic course, he also teaches upper division and graduate courses in communication theory, interpersonal communication, and communication research methods. His research interests include interpretive approaches to communication, particularly in the area of social constructionism. He has published work in interpersonal communication competence, conflict resolution, student outcomes assessment, the history of rhetoric, contemporary public address, and communication pedagogy. He is currently working with the Public Dialogue Consortium and the City of Cupertino, CA on a project to improve the quality of public discourse in local communities.

David E. Williams (Ph.D., Ohio University) is an Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at Texas Tech University. His research interests are in the areas of social movement research and forensics activities.

Andrew D. Wolvin (Ph.D., Purdue University) is Professor of Speech Communication and Director of the basic communication course at the University of Maryland, College Park. He has published research studies on the basic communication course and is co-author of three basic communication course texts.